arXiv:1401.4586v2 [hep-ph] 16 Aug 2014

Spontaneous R-parity violation in the minimal gauged $(B-L)$ supersymmetry with a 125 GeV Higgs

Chao-Hsi Chang[a,b,c*],Tai-Fu Feng[b,c†], Yu-Li Yan[b,c], Hai-Bin Zhang[c,d], Shu-Min Zhao[b,c‡]

[a] *CCAST (World Laboratory),P.O.Box 8730, Beijing 100190, China*

[b] *State Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics (KLTP),*

Institute of theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100190, China

[c] *Department of Physics, Hebei University, Baoding, 071002, China*

[d] *Department of Physics, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, 116024, China*

Abstract

We precisely derive the mass squared matrices for charged and neutral (CP-odd and CP-even) Higgs, as well as the mass matrices for neutrino-neutralino and charged lepton-chargino in the minimal R-parity violating supersymmetry with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry. In the framework the nonzero TeV scale vacuum expectations of right-handed sneutrinos induce the heavy mass of neutral $U(1)_{B-L}$ gauge boson, and result in relatively large mixing between the lightest CP-even Higgs and three generation right-handed sneutrinos when we include the one-loop corrections to the scalar potential. We numerically show that there is parameter space of the considered model to accommodate experimental data on the newly ones of Higgs signal from LHC and experimental observations on the neutrino oscillation simultaneously.

PACS numbers: 12.60.Jv, 14.60.St, 14.80.Cp

Keywords: supersymmetry, Higgs, neutrino

* email:zhangzx@itp.ac.cn

† email:fengtf@hbu.edu.cn

‡ email:zhaosm@hbu.edu.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

A main destination of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) is to understand the origin of the electroweak symmetry breaking, and to study the properties of neutral Higgs predicted by the Standard Model (SM) and its various extensions. In the year of 2012, ATLAS and CMS reported significantly excess events in a few channels which are interpreted as the neutral Higgs with mass $m_{h_0} \sim 124 - 126$ GeV[1, 2], and CP properties and couplings of the particle are also being established[3–6] recently. It implies that the Higgs mechanism to break electroweak symmetry has an experimental cornerstone now. Another important progress of particle physics in the last year is that nonzero experimental observation on the neutrino mixing angle θ_{13} is obtained with high precision[7], which opens several prospects for neutrino physics. In this work, we investigate the constraints on parameter space of the minimal R-parity violating supersymmetry with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry from the updated experimental data mentioned above.

R-parity, as a discrete symmetry, is defined through $R = (-1)^{3(B-L)+2S}$, where B, L and S are baryon number, lepton number and spin respectively for a concerned field[8]. When $B - L$ is violated by an even amount, R-parity conservation is guaranteed. However, breaking $B - L$ via nonzero vacuum expectation values (VEVs) of neutral scalar fields with odd $U(1)_{B-L}$ charges will induce the R-parity violation simultaneously. In the minimal supersymmetric extension of SM (MSSM) with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry, R-parity is spontaneously broken when left- and right-handed sneutrinos acquire nonzero VEVs[9–12]. Actually, both spontaneously violated R-parity and broken local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry replicate the MSSM with conserving baryon number but violating lepton number. The authors of Ref.[13] further propose an extension of the MSSM, which includes right-handed neutrino superfields and two additional superfields $\hat{X}$, $\hat{X}'$ with even $U(1)_{B-L}$ charges. When sneutrinos and scalar components of $\hat{X}$, $\hat{X}'$ acquire non zero VEVs simultaneously, local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry and R-parity are broken spontaneously. To account for the neutrino oscillation experiment, tiny neutrino masses are generated through an extended seesaw mechanism in the framework proposed in Ref.[9–13]. Furthermore, the neutral Higgs fields H_u^0, H_d^0 mix with the scalar components of neutrino superfields and $\hat{X}$, $\hat{X}'$ superfields after the electroweak symmetry is

broken in those models. Assuming that the scalar components of $\hat{X},\ \hat{X}'$ and neutral Higgs fields $H_u^0,\ H_d^0$ acquire nonzero VEVs, Ref.[14] studies mass spectrum in the model proposed in Ref.[13].

Here we study the constraints from the observed Higgs signal and neutrino oscillation experimental data on parameter space of the MSSM with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry in the scenarios where sneutrinos obtain nonzero VEVs[9–12]. Since the tree level mixing between the lightest CP-even Higgs and right-handed sneutrinos is suppressed by the tiny neutrino masses, we include the one-loop corrections to the mixing which are mainly originated from the third generation fermions and their supersymmetric partners. Numerically the MSSM with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry accommodates naturally the experimental data on the Higgs particle from ATLAS/CMS collaborations and the updated experimental observations on the neutrino oscillation simultaneously. In addition, the model also predicts two sterile neutrinos with sub-eV masses[15, 16], which are favored by the Big-bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) in cosmology[17].

Certainly the deviation from unitarity of the leptonic mixing matrix intervening in charged currents might induce a tree-level enhancement of $R_{_P} = \Gamma(P^+ \to e^+\nu)/\Gamma(P^+ \to \mu^+\nu)$ $(P^+ = K^+,\ \pi^+)$ [18] because of additional mixings between the active neutrinos and the sub-eV sterile states. Ignoring the difference between hadronic matrix elements in $P^+ \to e^+\nu$ and that in $P^+ \to \mu^+\nu$, one finds that the experimental observations on $R_{_P}$ also constrain the parameter space of considered model. Furthermore, the experimental data on Z invisible width[19] also constrain the mixings between the active neutrinos and the sub-eV sterile ones. We will address the constraints on the mixings between the active neutrinos and the sub-eV sterile ones from lepton flavor universality (LFU) and Z invisible width elsewhere [20].

Our presentation is organized as follows. In section II, we briefly summarize the main ingredients of the MSSM with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry, then present the mass squared matrices for CP-odd and charged Higgs sectors, respectively. We analyze the loop corrections on the mass squared matrix of CP-even Higgs in section III, and present the mass matrices for neutrino-neutralino and charged lepton-chargino in section IV and section V, respectively. Furthermore, we also present the decay widths for $h^0 \to \gamma\gamma,\ VV^*,\ (V = Z,\ W)$ in section

VI. The numerical analyses are given in section VII, and our conclusions are summarized in section VIII.

II. THE MSSM WITH LOCAL $U(1)_{B-L}$ SYMMETRY

When $U(1)_{B-L}$ is a local gauge symmetry, one can enlarge the local gauge group of the SM to $SU(3)_{C} \otimes SU(2)_{L} \otimes U(1)_{Y} \otimes U(1)_{(B-L)}$. In the model proposed in Ref.[9–12], the exotic superfields are three generation right-handed neutrinos $\hat{N}^{c}_{i} \sim (1,\ 1,\ 0,\ 1)$. Meanwhile, quantum numbers of the matter chiral superfields for quarks and leptons are given by

$$\hat{Q}_{I} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{U}_{I} \\ \hat{D}_{I} \end{pmatrix} \sim (3,\ 2,\ \frac{1}{3},\ \frac{1}{3}) \ , \quad \hat{L}_{I} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\nu}_{I} \\ \hat{E}_{I} \end{pmatrix} \sim (1,\ 2,\ -1,\ -1) \ ,$$
$$\hat{U}^{c}_{I} \sim (3,\ 1,\ -\frac{4}{3},\ -\frac{1}{3}) \ , \quad \hat{D}^{c}_{I} \sim (3,\ 1,\ \frac{2}{3},\ -\frac{1}{3}) \ , \quad \hat{E}^{c}_{I} \sim (1,\ 1,\ 2,\ 1) \ , \tag{1}$$

with $I = 1,\ 2,\ 3$ denoting the index of generation. In addition, the quantum numbers of two Higgs doublets are assigned as

$$\hat{H}_{u} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{H}^{+}_{u} \\ \hat{H}^{0}_{u} \end{pmatrix} \sim (1,\ 2,\ 1,\ 0) \ , \quad \hat{H}_{d} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{H}^{0}_{d} \\ \hat{H}^{-}_{d} \end{pmatrix} \sim (1,\ 2,\ -1,\ 0) \ . \tag{2}$$

The superpotential of the MSSM with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry is written as

$$\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_{MSSM} + \mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{(B-L)} \ . \tag{3}$$

Here $\mathcal{W}_{MSSM}$ is superpotential of the MSSM, and

$$\mathcal{W}^{(1)}_{(B-L)} = \Big(Y_{N}\Big)_{IJ} \hat{H}^{T}_{u} i\sigma_{2} \hat{L}_{I} \hat{N}^{c}_{J} \ . \tag{4}$$

Correspondingly, the soft breaking terms for the MSSM with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry are generally given as

$$\mathcal{L}_{soft} = \mathcal{L}^{MSSM}_{soft} + \mathcal{L}^{(1)}_{soft} \ . \tag{5}$$

Here $\mathcal{L}^{MSSM}_{soft}$ is soft breaking terms of the MSSM, and

$$\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_{soft} = -(m^{2}_{\tilde{N}^{c}})_{IJ} \tilde{N}^{c*}_{I} \tilde{N}^{c}_{J} - \Big(m_{BL} \lambda_{BL} \lambda_{BL} + h.c.\Big) + \Big\{\Big(A_{N}\Big)_{IJ} H^{T}_{u} i\sigma_{2} \tilde{L}_{I} \tilde{N}^{c}_{J} + h.c.\Big\} \ , \tag{6}$$

with $\lambda_{_{BL}}$ denoting the gaugino of $U(1)_{_{B-L}}$. After the $SU(2)_L$ doublets $H_{_u}$, $H_{_d}$, $\tilde{L}_{_I}$ and $SU(2)_L$ singlets $\tilde{N}^c_{_I}$ acquire the nonzero VEVs,

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{_u} &= \begin{pmatrix} H^+_{_u} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\upsilon_{_u} + H^0_{_u} + iP_{_u}\Big) \end{pmatrix} , \\
H_{_d} &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\upsilon_{_d} + H^0_{_d} + iP_{_d}\Big) \\ H^-_{_d} \end{pmatrix} , \\
\tilde{L}_{_I} &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\upsilon_{_{L_I}} + \tilde{\nu}_{_{L_I}} + iP_{_{L_I}}\Big) \\ \tilde{L}^-_{_I} \end{pmatrix} , \\
\tilde{N}^c_{_I} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\upsilon_{_{N_I}} + \tilde{\nu}_{_{R_I}} + iP_{_{N_I}}\Big) ,
\end{aligned} \tag{7}
$$

the R-parity is broken spontaneously, and the local gauge symmetry $SU(2)_{_L} \otimes U(1)_{_Y} \otimes U(1)_{_{(B-L)}}$ is broken down to the electromagnetic symmetry $U(1)_{_e}$. Assuming that all parameters are real, we obtain the minimization conditions at one-loop level in the model considered here

$$
\begin{aligned}
&T^0_{_u} + \Delta T_{_u}\upsilon_{_u} = 0 , \\
&T^0_{_d} + \Delta T_{_d}\upsilon_{_d} = 0 , \\
&T^0_{_{\tilde{L}_I}} + \Delta T_{_{\tilde{L}}}\upsilon_{_{L_I}} = 0 , \\
&T^0_{_{\tilde{N}_I}} + \Delta T_{_{\tilde{N}}}\upsilon_{_{N_I}} = 0 ,
\end{aligned} \tag{8}
$$

where $T^0_{_u}$, $T^0_{_d}$, $T^0_{_{\tilde{L}_I}}$, $T^0_{_{\tilde{N}_I}}$ denote the tree level tadpole conditions, and $\Delta T_{_u}$, $\Delta T_{_d}$, $\Delta T_{_{\tilde{L}}}$ as well as $\Delta T_{_{\tilde{N}}}$ are the one-loop radiative corrections to the minimization conditions from top, bottom, tau and their supersymmetric partners respectively, their concrete expressions are given in the appendix.B. After the local gauge group $SU(2)_{_L} \otimes U(1)_{_Y} \otimes U(1)_{_{(B-L)}}$ is broken down to the electromagnetic symmetry $U(1)_e$, the masses of neutral and charged gauge bosons are respectively formulated as

$$
\begin{aligned}
m^2_{_{\rm Z}} &= \frac{1}{4}(g^2_1 + g^2_2)\upsilon^2_{_{\rm EW}} , \\
m^2_{_{\rm W}} &= \frac{1}{4}g^2_2\upsilon^2_{_{\rm EW}} , \\
m^2_{_{Z_{BL}}} &= g^2_{_{BL}}\Big(\upsilon^2_{_N} + \upsilon^2_{_{\rm EW}} - \upsilon^2_{_{\rm SM}}\Big) .
\end{aligned} \tag{9}
$$

Where $v_{\rm SM}^2 = v_u^2 + v_d^2$, $v_{\rm EW}^2 = v_u^2 + v_d^2 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} v_{L_\alpha}^2$, $v_N^2 = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} v_{N_\alpha}^2$, and $g_2,\ g_1,\ g_{BL}$ denote the gauge couplings of $SU(2)_L,\ U(1)_Y$ and $U(1)_{(B-L)}$, respectively.

To satisfy present electroweak precision observations we assume the mass of neutral $U(1)_{(B-L)}$ gauge boson $m_{Z_{BL}} > 1$ TeV which implies $v_N > 1$ TeV when $g_{BL} < 1$, then we derive $\max((Y_N)_{ij}) \leq 10^{-6}$ and $\max(v_{L_I}) \leq 10^{-3}$ GeV[12] to explain experimental data on neutrino oscillation. Ignoring the small terms and assuming that the 3×3 matrices $m_{\tilde{L}}^2,\ m_{\tilde{N}^c}^2$ are real, we simplify the minimization conditions in Eq.(8) as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& v_u\Big\{\mu^2 + m_{H_u}^2 + \frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{8}\Big(2v_u^2 - v_{\rm EW}^2\Big) + \Delta T_u\Big\} + B\mu v_d \simeq 0\ , \\
& v_d\Big\{\mu^2 + m_{H_d}^2 - \frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{8}\Big(2v_u^2 - v_{\rm EW}^2\Big) + \Delta T_d\Big\} + B\mu v_u \simeq 0\ , \\
& \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\Big[\Big(m_{\tilde{L}}^2\Big)_{I\alpha} + \Delta T_{\tilde{L}}\delta_{I\alpha}\Big]v_{L_\alpha} + \frac{v_u}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\Big(A_N\Big)_{I\alpha}v_{N_\alpha} + \frac{\mu v_d}{\sqrt{2}}\zeta_I \\
& -v_{L_I}\Big\{\frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{8}\Big(2v_u^2 - v_{\rm EW}^2\Big) + \frac{m_{Z_{BL}}^2}{2}\Big\} \simeq 0\ , \\
& \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\Big[\Big(m_{\tilde{N}^c}^2\Big)_{I\alpha} + \Delta T_{\tilde{N}}\delta_{I\alpha}\Big]v_{N_\alpha} + \frac{m_{Z_{BL}}^2}{2}v_{N_I} \simeq 0\ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{10}
$$

with $\zeta_I = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\Big(Y_N\Big)_{I\alpha}v_{N_\alpha}$. Note here that the first two minimization conditions respectively for $H_u^0,\ H_d^0$ are not greatly modified from that in the MSSM, the third condition keeps the linear terms of v_{L_I} or Y_N, and the last equation implies that the vector $(v_{N_1},\ v_{N_2},\ v_{N_3})$ is an eigenvector of 3×3 mass squared matrix $m_{\tilde{N}^c}^2$ with eigenvalue $-m_{Z_{BL}}^2/2 - \Delta T_{\tilde{N}}$. A possible symmetric 3×3 matrix satisfying the last equation in Eq.(10) is written as

$$
m_{\tilde{N}^c}^2 \simeq \begin{pmatrix}
\Lambda_{\tilde{N}_1^c}^2 - \Lambda_{BL}^2\ , & 0\ , & -\frac{v_{N_1}}{v_{N_3}}\Lambda_{\tilde{N}_1^c}^2 \\
0\ , & \Lambda_{\tilde{N}_2^c}^2 - \Lambda_{BL}^2\ , & -\frac{v_{N_2}}{v_{N_3}}\Lambda_{\tilde{N}_2^c}^2 \\
-\frac{v_{N_1}}{v_{N_3}}\Lambda_{\tilde{N}_1^c}^2\ , & -\frac{v_{N_2}}{v_{N_3}}\Lambda_{\tilde{N}_2^c}^2\ , & \frac{v_{N_1}^2\Lambda_{\tilde{N}_1^c}^2 + v_{N_2}^2\Lambda_{\tilde{N}_2^c}^2}{v_{N_3}^2} - \Lambda_{BL}^2
\end{pmatrix}
\tag{11}
$$

with $\Lambda_{BL}^2 = m_{Z_{BL}}^2/2 + \Delta T_{\tilde{N}}$. In order to make our final results transparently, we further assume in our following discussion

$$
\Big(m_{\tilde{L}}^2\Big)_{IJ} \simeq m_{\tilde{L}_I}^2\,\delta_{IJ}\ ,\ \ (I,\ J = 1,\ 2,\ 3)\ ,
\tag{12}
$$

then we obtain

$$v_{L_I} \simeq -\frac{4\sqrt{2}\Big[v_u \sum\limits_{\alpha=1}^{3}\Big(A_N\Big)_{I\alpha} v_{N_\alpha} + \mu v_d \zeta_I\Big]}{8(m^2_{\tilde{L}_I} + \Delta T_{\tilde{L}}) - (g_1^2+g_2^2)\Big(v_u^2 - v_d^2\Big) - 4m^2_{Z_{BL}}} \ . \tag{13}$$

As $m_{\tilde{L}_I} \sim 1$ TeV, the condition $\max(v_{L_I}) \leq 10^{-2}$ GeV requires $A_N \sim 0.01$ GeV. This implies that tree level contributions to the mixing between the lightest CP-even Higgs and right-handed sneutrinos can be ignored, leading contributions to the mixing are mainly originated from one-loop radiative corrections.

A. The mass squared matrix for charged Higgs

Using those minimization conditions, we derive the 8×8 mass squared matrix for charged Higgs

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Big[\mathcal{M}^2_{CH}\Big]_{2\times 2} & \Big[A_{CH}\Big]_{2\times 6} \\ \Big[A^T_{CH}\Big]_{6\times 2} & \Big[M^2_{\tilde{E}}\Big]_{6\times 6} \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{14}$$

in the interaction eigenstates $H^T_{CH} = (H^-_u,\ H^-_d,\ \tilde{L}^-_I,\ \tilde{E}^{c*}_J),\ \ (I,\ J = 1,\ 2,\ 3)$. Here, elements of the 2×2 matrix $\mathcal{M}^2_{CH}$ are given as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big[\mathcal{M}^2_{CH}\Big]_{11} &= \Big(B\mu + \Delta_{odd}\Big)\frac{v_d}{v_u} - \frac{g_2^2}{4}\Big(v^2_{\rm EW} - v^2_u\Big) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}v_u}\sum_{\alpha,\beta}^{3} v_{L_\alpha}\Big(A_N\Big)_{\alpha\beta} v_{N_\beta} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha,\beta}^{3} v_{L_\alpha}\Big(Y_N Y_N^\dagger\Big)_{\alpha\beta} v_{L_\beta} \ , \\
\Big[\mathcal{M}^2_{CH}\Big]_{12} &= \Big(B\mu + \Delta_{odd}\Big) - \frac{g_2^2}{4} v_u v_d \ , \\
\Big[\mathcal{M}^2_{CH}\Big]_{22} &= \Big(B\mu + \Delta_{odd}\Big)\frac{v_u}{v_d} + \frac{g_2^2}{4}\Big(v^2_{\rm EW} - v^2_{\rm SM} - v^2_u\Big) + \frac{\mu\varepsilon^2_N}{\sqrt{2}v_d} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{3} v_{L_\alpha}\Big(Y_E Y_E^T\Big)_{\alpha\beta} v_{L_\beta} \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

with $\varepsilon^2_N = \sum\limits_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{3} v_{L_\alpha}\Big(Y_N\Big)_{\alpha\beta} v_{N_\beta}$. Additionally the 3×3 matrix Y_E is Yukawa couplings in charged lepton sector, and the one-loop radiative correction is written as

$$\Delta_{odd} = \frac{3g_2^2}{32\pi^2 \sin^2\beta}\frac{m_t^2 A_t \mu}{m^2_{\rm W}}\frac{f(m^2_{\tilde{t}_1}) - f(m^2_{\tilde{t}_2})}{m^2_{\tilde{t}_1} - m^2_{\tilde{t}_2}}$$

$$+\frac{3g_2^2}{32\pi^2\cos^2\beta}\frac{m_b^2 A_b \mu}{m_{\rm W}^2}\frac{f(m^2_{\tilde{b}_1})-f(m^2_{\tilde{b}_2})}{m^2_{\tilde{b}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{b}_2}}$$
$$+\frac{g_2^2}{32\pi^2\cos^2\beta}\frac{m_\tau^2 A_\tau \mu}{m_{\rm W}^2}\frac{f(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1})-f(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2})}{m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2}}\ . \tag{16}$$

Here $m^2_{\tilde{t}_{1,2}}$, $m^2_{\tilde{b}_{1,2}}$ and $m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_{1,2}}$ are the eigenvalues of the $\tilde{t}$, $\tilde{b}$ and $\tilde{\tau}$ mass-squared matrices, the form factor $f(m^2)=m^2(\ln(m^2/\Lambda^2)-1)$ with Λ denoting renormalization scale. Additionally, the concrete expressions for the symmetric matrix $M^2_{\tilde{E}}$ and A_{CH} can be found in appendix.B. Actually, the symmetric matrix in Eq.(14) contains an eigenvector with zero eigenvalue

$$G^\pm=\frac{v_u}{v_{\rm EW}}H_u^\pm-\frac{v_d}{v_{\rm EW}}H_d^\pm-\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\frac{v_{L_\alpha}}{v_{\rm EW}}\tilde{L}_\alpha^\pm\ , \tag{17}$$

which corresponds to the charged Goldstone eaten by charged gauge boson as electroweak symmetry broken spontaneously. Applying the 8×8 orthogonal matrix

$$\mathcal{Z}^{(0)}_{CH}=Z^{(0)}_{CH}\bigoplus 1_{3\times 3}\ , \tag{18}$$

we separate the charged Goldstone boson from the physical states:

$$\mathcal{Z}^{(0)T}_{CH}\cdot\begin{pmatrix}\left[\mathcal{M}^2_{CH}\right]_{2\times 2} & \left[A_{CH}\right]_{2\times 6}\\ \left[A^T_{CH}\right]_{6\times 2} & \left[M^2_{\tilde{E}}\right]_{6\times 6}\end{pmatrix}\cdot\mathcal{Z}^{(0)}_{CH}=\begin{pmatrix}0 & 0_{1\times 7}\\ 0_{7\times 1} & M^2_{H^\pm}\end{pmatrix}\ . \tag{19}$$

Where the 5×5 orthogonal matrix $Z^{(0)}_{CH}$ is given as

$$Z^{(0)}_{CH}=\begin{pmatrix}\frac{v_u}{v_{\rm EW}}, & \frac{v_d}{v_{\rm SM}}, & \left(\frac{v_u v_{L_K}}{v_{\rm SM}v_{\rm EW}}\right)_{1\times 3}\\ -\frac{v_d}{v_{\rm EW}}, & \frac{v_u}{v_{\rm SM}}, & \left(-\frac{v_d v_{L_K}}{v_{\rm SM}v_{\rm EW}}\right)_{1\times 3}\\ \left(-\frac{v_{L_I}}{v_{\rm EW}}\right)_{3\times 1}, & 0_{3\times 1}, & \left(\frac{v_{\rm SM}}{v_{\rm EW}}\delta_{IK}+\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\varepsilon_{IK\alpha}\frac{v_{L_\alpha}}{v_{\rm EW}}\right)_{3\times 3}\end{pmatrix}\ . \tag{20}$$

Finally, we give the 8×8 mixing matrix Z_{CH} in charged Higgs sector as

$$Z_{CH}=\mathcal{Z}^{(0)}_{CH}\cdot\begin{pmatrix}1 & 0_{1\times 7}\\ 0_{7\times 1} & \left[Z_{H^\pm}\right]_{7\times 7}\end{pmatrix} \tag{21}$$

with $Z^\dagger_{H^\pm}\cdot M^2_{H^\pm}\cdot Z_{H^\pm}=diag(m^2_{H_2^\pm},\cdots,m^2_{H_8^\pm})$.

B. The mass squared matrix for CP-odd Higgs

In the interaction basis $P^{0,T}=(P^0_{u},\ P^0_{d},\ P^0_{\tilde{L}_I},\ P^0_{\tilde{N}_J})$, $(I,\ J=1,\ 2,\ 3)$, the 8×8 mass matrix for neutral CP-odd scalars is

$$\begin{pmatrix} \left[\mathcal{M}^2_{CPO}\right]_{2\times 2} & \left[A^{(0)}_{CPO}\right]_{2\times 6} \\ \left[A^{(0)T}_{CPO}\right]_{6\times 2} & \left[M^2_{P}\right]_{6\times 6} \end{pmatrix} , \tag{22}$$

the elements of 2×2 mass squared matrix are

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\mathcal{M}^2_{CPO}\right]_{11} &= \left(B\mu+\Delta_{odd}\right)\frac{\upsilon_d}{\upsilon_u}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\upsilon_u}\sum_{\alpha,\beta}^{3}\upsilon_{L_\alpha}\left(A_N\right)_{\alpha\beta}\upsilon_{N_\beta} , \\ \left[\mathcal{M}^2_{CPO}\right]_{12} &= B\mu+\Delta_{odd} , \\ \left[\mathcal{M}^2_{CPO}\right]_{22} &= \left(B\mu+\Delta_{odd}\right)\frac{\upsilon_u}{\upsilon_d}+\frac{\mu\varepsilon^2_N}{\sqrt{2}\upsilon_d} . \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

As we assign the VEVs of left-handed sneutrinos to zero, the expressions in Eq.(23) recover the elements of mass-squared matrix for CP-odd Higgs in the MSSM. Additionally, the concrete expressions for elements of the matrix $A^{(0)}_{CPO}$ can be found in appendix.B. Similarly, the symmetric matrix in Eq.(22) contains two massless eigenstates which correspond to the neutral Goldstones swallowed by neutral gauge bosons Z, Z_{BL} after the symmetry $SU(2)\times U_{Y}(1)\times U_{(B-L)}$ is broken down to the electromagnetic symmetry $U_e(1)$:

$$\begin{aligned} G^0 &= \frac{\upsilon_u}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}P^0_{u}-\frac{\upsilon_d}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}P^0_{d}-\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\frac{\upsilon_{L_\alpha}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}P^0_{\tilde{L}_\alpha} , \\ G^0_{(B-L)} &= \eta\frac{\upsilon_u}{\upsilon_t}P^0_{u}-\eta\frac{\upsilon_d}{\upsilon_t}P^0_{d}+(1-\eta)\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\frac{\upsilon_{L_\alpha}}{\upsilon_t}P^0_{\tilde{L}_\alpha}-\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\frac{\upsilon_{N_\alpha}}{\upsilon_t}P^0_{\tilde{N}_\alpha} , \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

with $\eta=1-\frac{\upsilon^2_{\rm SM}}{\upsilon^2_{\rm EW}}$, and $\upsilon^2_t=\upsilon^2_{\rm N}+\eta\upsilon^2_{\rm SM}$. To separate neutral Goldstones from physical states, we define the 8×8 orthogonal matrix

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}^{(0)}_{P} &= \left\{Z^{(0)}_{CH}\bigoplus\mathcal{Z}^{P}_{\tilde{N}^c}\right\} \\ &\times\left\{1_{2\times 2}\bigoplus\begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\upsilon_{\rm SM}\upsilon_{L_1}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}\upsilon_t}, & \frac{\upsilon_N}{\upsilon_t}, & \frac{\upsilon_{\rm SM}\upsilon_{L_3}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}\upsilon_t}, & -\frac{\upsilon_{\rm SM}\upsilon_{L_2}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}\upsilon_t} \\ -\frac{\upsilon_{\rm SM}\upsilon_{L_2}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}\upsilon_t}, & -\frac{\upsilon_{\rm SM}\upsilon_{L_3}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}\upsilon_t}, & \frac{\upsilon_N}{\upsilon_t}, & \frac{\upsilon_{\rm SM}\upsilon_{L_1}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}\upsilon_t} \\ -\frac{\upsilon_{\rm SM}\upsilon_{L_3}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}\upsilon_t}, & \frac{\upsilon_{\rm SM}\upsilon_{L_2}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}\upsilon_t}, & -\frac{\upsilon_{\rm SM}\upsilon_{L_1}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}\upsilon_t}, & \frac{\upsilon_N}{\upsilon_t} \\ \frac{\upsilon_N}{\upsilon_t}, & \frac{\upsilon_{\rm SM}\upsilon_{L_1}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}\upsilon_t}, & \frac{\upsilon_{\rm SM}\upsilon_{L_2}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}\upsilon_t}, & \frac{\upsilon_{\rm SM}\upsilon_{L_3}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}\upsilon_t} \end{pmatrix}\bigoplus 1_{2\times 2}\right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\times\left\{\begin{pmatrix}1,\ 0,\ 0\\ 0,\ 0,\ 1\\ 0,\ 1,\ 0\end{pmatrix}\bigoplus 1_{5\times5}\right\}\ , \tag{25}$$

then we have

$$\mathcal{Z}_{_P}^{(0)T}\cdot\begin{pmatrix}\left[\mathcal{M}^2_{_{CPO}}\right]_{2\times2} & \left[A_{_{CPO}}\right]_{2\times6}\\ \left[A^T_{_{CPO}}\right]_{6\times2} & \left[M^2_{_P}\right]_{6\times6}\end{pmatrix}\cdot\mathcal{Z}_{_P}^{(0)}=\begin{pmatrix}0_{2\times2} & 0_{2\times6}\ ,\\ 0_{6\times2} & \left[M^2_{_{P^0}}\right]_{6\times6}\end{pmatrix}\ .$$

Finally, the 8×8 mixing matrix $Z_{_{A^0}}$ in CP-odd Higgs sector is written as

$$Z_{_{A^0}}=\mathcal{Z}_{_P}^{(0)}\cdot\begin{pmatrix}1_{2\times2} & 0_{2\times6}\\ 0_{6\times2} & \left(Z_{_P}\right)_{6\times6}\end{pmatrix} \tag{26}$$

with $Z_{_P}^{\dagger}\cdot M^2_{_{P^0}}\cdot Z_{_P}=\mathrm{diag}(m^2_{_{A^0_3}},\cdots,m^2_{_{A^0_8}})$.

Where

$$\mathcal{Z}^{P,T}_{_{\tilde{N}^c}}m^2_{_{\tilde{N}^c}}\mathcal{Z}^{P}_{_{\tilde{N}^c}}=\mathrm{diag}(0,\frac{\omega_{_A}-\omega_{_B}}{2v^2_{_{N_3}}},\ \frac{\omega_{_A}+\omega_{_B}}{2v^2_{_{N_3}}})\ , \tag{27}$$

and the concrete expressions for $\omega_{_{A,B}}$ are

$$\begin{aligned}&\omega_{_A}=\Lambda^2_{_{\tilde{N}^c_1}}\left(v^2_{_N}-v^2_{_{N_2}}\right)+\Lambda^2_{_{\tilde{N}^c_2}}\left(v^2_{_N}-v^2_{_{N_1}}\right)\ ,\\ &\omega^2_{_B}=\omega^2_{_A}-4\Lambda^2_{_{\tilde{N}^c_1}}\Lambda^2_{_{\tilde{N}^c_2}}v^2_{_N}v^2_{_{N_3}}\ .\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Additionally the orthogonal 3×3 rotation is written as

$$\begin{aligned}&\begin{pmatrix}\left(\mathcal{Z}^P_{_{\tilde{N}^c}}\right)_{11}\\ \left(\mathcal{Z}^P_{_{\tilde{N}^c}}\right)_{21}\\ \left(\mathcal{Z}^P_{_{\tilde{N}^c}}\right)_{31}\end{pmatrix}=\frac{1}{v_{_N}}\begin{pmatrix}v_{_{N_1}}\\ v_{_{N_2}}\\ v_{_{N_3}}\end{pmatrix}\ ,\\ &\begin{pmatrix}\left(\mathcal{Z}^P_{_{\tilde{N}^c}}\right)_{12}\\ \left(\mathcal{Z}^P_{_{\tilde{N}^c}}\right)_{22}\\ \left(\mathcal{Z}^P_{_{\tilde{N}^c}}\right)_{32}\end{pmatrix}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{|x_-|^2+|y|^2+|z_-|^2}}\begin{pmatrix}x_-\\ y\\ z_-\end{pmatrix}\ ,\\ &\begin{pmatrix}\left(\mathcal{Z}^P_{_{\tilde{N}^c}}\right)_{13}\\ \left(\mathcal{Z}^P_{_{\tilde{N}^c}}\right)_{23}\\ \left(\mathcal{Z}^P_{_{\tilde{N}^c}}\right)_{33}\end{pmatrix}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{|x_+|^2+|y|^2+|z_+|^2}}\begin{pmatrix}x_+\\ y\\ z_+\end{pmatrix}\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{\mp} &= -\frac{\Lambda^4_{\tilde{N}^c_2} v^2_{N_2}}{\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_1} v_{N_1} v_{N_3}} + \Big[\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_2} - \frac{\omega_A \mp \omega_B}{2v^2_{N_3}}\Big]\Big\{\frac{v_{N_1}}{v_{N_3}} \\
&\quad + \frac{\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_2} v^2_{N_2}}{\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_1} v_{N_1} v_{N_3}} - \frac{\omega_A \mp \omega_B}{2\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_1} v_{N_1} v_{N_3}}\Big\} , \\
y &= \frac{\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_2} v_{N_2}}{v_{N_3}} , \\
z_{\mp} &= \Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_2} - \frac{\omega_A \mp \omega_B}{2v^2_{N_3}} .
\end{aligned} \tag{30}
$$

Since one-loop effective potential does not induce corrections to the mixing between P_u, P_d and P_{L_I}, P_{N_I}, the mixing is dominated by the 2×6 matrix $A^{(0)}_{CPO}$ originating from tree level contributions. Considering the constraints from neutrino oscillation, we derive the correction to mass of the lightest CP-odd neutral Higgs ~ 0.01 GeV from the mixing between P_u, P_d and P_{L_I}, P_{N_I} as $m_{\tilde{L}_I} \simeq \Lambda_{\tilde{N}^c_{1,2}} \simeq m_{Z_{BL}} \sim 1$ TeV. This fact implies the mass of the lightest CP-odd Higgs

$$
m^2_{A^0_3} \simeq \frac{B\mu + \Delta_{odd}}{\sin 2\beta} , \tag{31}
$$

here we adopt the definition

$$
\tan\beta = v_u \Big/ \sqrt{v^2_d + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} v^2_{L_\alpha}} . \tag{32}
$$

Accordingly the masses of other CP-odd scalars are formulated as

$$
\begin{aligned}
m^2_{A^0_{(3+i)}} &\simeq m^2_{\tilde{L}_i} + \Delta T_{\tilde{L}} + \frac{1}{2}\Big(m^2_{\rm Z}\cos 2\beta - m^2_{Z_{BL}}\Big) , \quad (i = 1,\ 2,\ 3) , \\
m^2_{A^0_7} &\simeq \frac{\omega_A - \omega_B}{2v^2_{N_3}} , \\
m^2_{A^0_8} &\simeq \frac{\omega_A + \omega_B}{2v^2_{N_3}} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{33}
$$

and the 6×6 mixing matrix is approximated as

$$
Z_P \simeq \begin{pmatrix}
1 & \Big[\frac{(\delta^2 m^{odd}_{HL})_I}{m^2_{A^0_{(3+I)}} - m^2_{A^0_3}}\Big]_{1\times 3} & 0_{1\times 2} \\
-\Big[\frac{(\delta^2 m^{odd}_{HL})_I}{m^2_{A^0_{(3+I)}} - m^2_{A^0_3}}\Big]_{3\times 1} & 1_{3\times 3} & 0_{3\times 2} \\
0_{2\times 1} & 0_{2\times 3} & 1_{2\times 2}
\end{pmatrix} . \tag{34}
$$

Where

$$(\delta^2 m^{odd}_{_{HL}})_I \simeq -\frac{\mu \upsilon_{_{EW}}}{\sqrt{2}\upsilon_{_u}}\zeta_I + \cos\beta\Big[m^2_{_{\tilde{L}_I}} + \frac{1}{2}m^2_{_{Z_{BL}}} + \frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{8}(\upsilon^2_{_u}-\upsilon^2_{_d})\Big]\frac{\upsilon_{_{L_I}}}{\upsilon_{_u}} \tag{35}$$

III. THE LIGHTEST CP-EVEN HIGGS MASS MATRIX

It is well known for quite long time that radiative corrections modify the tree level mass squared matrix of neutral Higgs substantially in supersymmetry, and the main effect in those radiative contributions originates from Feynman loops involving the third generation fermions and their supersymmetric partners[21]. In order to obtain mass of the lightest neutral CP-even Higgs reasonably, we should also include the one-loop corrections from those fermions and corresponding supersymmetric partner in the MSSM with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry. In the interaction basis $H^{0,T} = (H^0_{_u},\ H^0_{_d},\ \tilde{\nu}_{_{L_I}},\ \tilde{\nu}_{_{R_J}})\ \ (I,\ J = 1,\ 2,\ 3)$, the 8×8 symmetric mass squared matrix is written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Big[M^2_{_{H^0}}\Big]_{2\times 2} & \Big[A_{_{CPE}}\Big]_{2\times 6} \\ \Big[A^T_{_{CPE}}\Big]_{6\times 2} & \Big[M^2_{_S}\Big]_{6\times 6} \end{pmatrix}\ , \tag{36}$$

here the 2×2 mass squared matrix $M^2_{_{H^0}}$ is

$$M^2_{_{H^0}} = \begin{pmatrix} \Big[\mathcal{M}^2_{_{CPE}}\Big]_{11} + \Delta_{11} & \Big[\mathcal{M}^2_{_{CPE}}\Big]_{12} + \Delta_{12} \\ \Big[\mathcal{M}^2_{_{CPE}}\Big]_{12} + \Delta_{12} & \Big[\mathcal{M}^2_{_{CPE}}\Big]_{22} + \Delta_{22} \end{pmatrix}\ , \tag{37}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Big[\mathcal{M}^2_{_{CPE}}\Big]_{11} &= \Big(B\mu + \Delta_{odd}\Big)\frac{\upsilon_{_d}}{\upsilon_{_u}} + m^2_{_Z}\sin^2\beta\ , \\ \Big[\mathcal{M}^2_{_{CPE}}\Big]_{12} &= -\Big(B\mu + \Delta_{odd}\Big) - m^2_{_Z}\sin\beta\cos\beta\ , \\ \Big[\mathcal{M}^2_{_{CPE}}\Big]_{22} &= \Big(B\mu + \Delta_{odd}\Big)\frac{\upsilon_{_u}}{\upsilon_{_d}} + m^2_{_Z}\cos^2\beta\ . \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{11} &= \Delta^T_{11} + \Delta^B_{11} + \Delta^L_{11}\ , \\ \Delta_{12} &= \Delta^T_{12} + \Delta^B_{12} + \Delta^L_{12}\ , \\ \Delta_{22} &= \Delta^T_{22} + \Delta^B_{22} + \Delta^L_{22}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

and $\Delta^T_{11},\ \Delta^T_{12},\ \Delta^T_{22}$ represent the tree level corrections to CP-even Higgs mass squared matrix from sneutrinos after electroweak symmetry is broken:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta^T_{11} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\upsilon_{_u}}\sum_{\alpha,\beta}^{3}\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}\Big(A_{_N}\Big)_{\alpha\beta}\upsilon_{_{N_\beta}}\ , \\
\Delta^T_{12} &= m^2_{_Z}\sin\beta\cos\beta\Big\{1-\frac{\upsilon_{_d}}{\sqrt{\upsilon^2_{_d}+\upsilon^2_{_{\rm EW}}-\upsilon^2_{_{\rm SM}}}}\Big\}\ , \\
\Delta^T_{22} &= \frac{g^2_1+g^2_2}{4}(\upsilon^2_{_{\rm EW}}-\upsilon^2_{_{\rm SM}})+\frac{\mu\varepsilon^2_{_N}}{\sqrt{2}\upsilon_{_d}}\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

In fact $\Delta^T_{11}=\Delta^T_{12}=\Delta^T_{22}=0$ when the VEVs of left-handed sneutrinos are assigned to zero. The concrete expressions for the radiative corrections from quark sector Δ^B_{ij} $(i,j=1,\ 2)$ up to two-loop level can be found in literature[22], and the one-loop corrections from lepton sectors can also be found in [23] within framework of the MSSM. Obviously radiative corrections modify the mass spectrum of neutral Higgs drastically, and two-loop corrections decrease that from one-loop in most of the MSSM parameter space. Here it is sufficient to include the one-loop corrections and the leading terms of two-loop corrections to the mass matrix of CP-even Higgs, and the expressions for $\Delta^B_{ij},\ \Delta^L_{ij}$ are given in appendix.C.

Furthermore, the 2×6 matrix $A_{_{CPE}}$ is

$$A_{_{CPE}}=A^{(0)}_{_{CPE}}+\Delta A_{_{CPE}}\ , \tag{41}$$

where the tree level contribution $A^{(0)}_{_{CPE}}$ is given in appendix.B, and nontrivial one-loop corrections $\Delta A_{_{CPE}}$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big(\Delta A_{_{CPE}}\Big)_{1(3+I)} &= \frac{G_{_F}m^2_{_t}}{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2}\frac{g^2_{_{BL}}\upsilon_{_u}\upsilon_{_{N_I}}}{\sin^2\beta}\Big(m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_L}}-m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_R}}\Big)\Big\{\frac{\ln m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_1}}-\ln m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_2}}}{m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_1}}-m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_2}}} \\
&\quad +\frac{A_{_t}(A_{_t}-\mu\cot\beta)}{(m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_1}}-m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_2}})^2}g(m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_1}},m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_2}})\Big\} \\
&\quad -\frac{G_{_F}m^2_{_b}}{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2}\frac{g^2_{_{BL}}\upsilon_{_d}\upsilon_{_{N_I}}}{\cos^2\beta}\Big(m^2_{_{\tilde{b}_L}}-m^2_{_{\tilde{b}_R}}\Big)\frac{\mu(A_{_b}-\mu\tan\beta)}{(m^2_{_{\tilde{b}_1}}-m^2_{_{\tilde{b}_2}})^2}g(m^2_{_{\tilde{b}_1}},m^2_{_{\tilde{b}_2}}) \\
&\quad -\frac{G_{_F}m^2_{_\tau}}{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2}\frac{g^2_{_{BL}}\upsilon_{_d}\upsilon_{_{N_I}}}{\cos^2\beta}\Big(m^2_{_{\tilde{\tau}_L}}-m^2_{_{\tilde{\tau}_R}}\Big)\frac{\mu(A_{_\tau}-\mu\tan\beta)}{(m^2_{_{\tilde{\tau}_1}}-m^2_{_{\tilde{\tau}_2}})^2}g(m^2_{_{\tilde{\tau}_1}},m^2_{_{\tilde{\tau}_2}})\ , \\
\Big(\Delta A_{_{CPE}}\Big)_{2(3+I)} &= -\frac{G_{_F}m^2_{_t}}{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2}\frac{g^2_{_{BL}}\upsilon_{_u}\upsilon_{_{N_I}}}{\sin^2\beta}\Big(m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_L}}-m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_R}}\Big)\frac{\mu(A_{_t}-\mu\cot\beta)}{(m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_1}}-m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_2}})^2}g(m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_1}},m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_2}})
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{G_{_F} m_{_b}^2}{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2}\frac{g_{_{BL}}^2 v_{_d} v_{_{N_I}}}{\cos^2\beta}\Big(m_{_{\tilde{b}_L}}^2 - m_{_{\tilde{b}_R}}^2\Big)\Big\{\frac{\ln m_{_{\tilde{b}_1}}^2 - \ln m_{_{\tilde{b}_2}}^2}{m_{_{\tilde{b}_1}}^2 - m_{_{\tilde{b}_2}}^2} \\
&+\frac{A_{_b}(A_{_b} - \mu\tan\beta)}{(m_{_{\tilde{b}_1}}^2 - m_{_{\tilde{b}_2}}^2)^2} g(m_{_{\tilde{b}_1}}^2, m_{_{\tilde{b}_2}}^2)\Big\} \\
&+\frac{G_{_F} m_{_\tau}^2}{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2}\frac{g_{_{BL}}^2 v_{_d} v_{_{N_I}}}{\cos^2\beta}\Big(m_{_{\tilde{\tau}_L}}^2 - m_{_{\tilde{\tau}_R}}^2\Big)\Big\{\frac{\ln m_{_{\tilde{\tau}_1}}^2 - \ln m_{_{\tilde{\tau}_2}}^2}{m_{_{\tilde{\tau}_1}}^2 - m_{_{\tilde{\tau}_2}}^2} \\
&+\frac{A_{_\tau}(A_{_\tau} - \mu\tan\beta)}{(m_{_{\tilde{\tau}_1}}^2 - m_{_{\tilde{\tau}_2}}^2)^2} g(m_{_{\tilde{\tau}_1}}^2, m_{_{\tilde{\tau}_2}}^2)\Big\}\ , \quad (I = 1,\ 2,\ 3)\ , \qquad (42)
\end{aligned}
$$

with the concrete expression of $g(x, y)$ presented in appendix.C. Meanwhile the radiative corrections to $\Big(\Delta A_{_{CPE}}\Big)_{1I}$, $\Big(\Delta A_{_{CPE}}\Big)_{2I}$ are proportional to $v_{_{L_I}}$, and can be neglected safely here. Note that $\Big(\Delta A_{_{CPE}}\Big)_{1(3+I)}$, $\Big(\Delta A_{_{CPE}}\Big)_{2(3+I)}$ are independent of the renormalization scale Λ, as they should be.

At the tree level, i.e. $\Delta_{ij}^{B} = \Delta_{ij}^{L} = 0$ $(i, j = 1,\ 2)$ and $\Delta A_{_{CPE}} = 0$, there are relations between the CP-even and CP-odd Higgs masses[24]

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{8} m_{_{H_i^0}}^2 = m_{_{\rm Z}}^2 + m_{_{Z_{BL}}}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{6} m_{_{A_{(2+i)}}}^2\ , \\
&\prod_{i=1}^{8} m_{_{H_i^0}}^2 = \Big(\frac{v_{_{\rm EW}}^2 - 2v_{_u}^2}{v_{_{\rm EW}}^2}\Big)^2\Big(\frac{v_{_{\rm N}}^2 - v_{_{\rm EW}}^2 + v_{_{\rm SM}}^2}{v_{_{\rm N}}^2 + v_{_{\rm EW}}^2 - v_{_{\rm SM}}^2}\Big)^2 m_{_{\rm Z}}^2 m_{_{Z_{BL}}}^2 \prod_{i=1}^{6} m_{_{A_{(2+i)}}}^2\ . \qquad (43)
\end{aligned}
$$

Certainly, radiative corrections to the neutral Higgs mass squared matrices destroy the relations in Eq.(43) strongly.

Considering the constraints from neutrino oscillation on parameter space of the model considered here, we find that the radiative correction from right-handed neutrinos/sneutrinos on the lightest CP-even Higgs mass is negligible. This conclusion coincides with that presented in Ref[25].

Applying above equations, one finds that the mass squared matrices for real part of sneutrinos is approximately approached as

$$
M_{_S}^2 \simeq \begin{pmatrix}
\Big[\begin{matrix}[\delta^2 m_{_{LL}}^{even}]_{IJ} + (m_{_{\tilde{L}_I}}^2 + \Delta T_{_{\tilde{L}}})\delta_{IJ} \\ +\Big(\frac{1}{2}m_{_{\rm Z}}^2\cos 2\beta - \frac{m_{_{Z_{BL}}}^2}{2}\Big)\delta_{IJ}\end{matrix}\Big]_{3\times 3} & \Big[\Big(\delta^2 m_{_{LR}}^{even}\Big)_{IJ'}\Big]_{3\times 3} \\
\Big[\Big(\delta^2 m_{_{LR}}^{even}\Big)_{I'J}\Big]_{3\times 3}\ , & \Big[\Big(M_{_{\tilde{N}^c}}^2\Big)_{I'J'} + \Big(\delta^2 m_{_{RR}}^{even}\Big)_{IJ'}\Big]_{3\times 3}
\end{pmatrix} \qquad (44)
$$

where the 3×3 mass squared matrix $M^2_{\tilde{N}^c}$ is

$$M^2_{\tilde{N}^c}\simeq\begin{pmatrix}\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_1}+\frac{g^2_{BL}}{2}\upsilon^2_{N_1}\ , & \frac{g^2_{BL}}{2}\upsilon_{N_1}\upsilon_{N_2}\ , & \frac{g^2_{BL}}{2}\upsilon_{N_1}\upsilon_{N_3}-\frac{\upsilon_{N_1}}{\upsilon_{N_3}}\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_1}\\ \frac{g^2_{BL}}{2}\upsilon_{N_1}\upsilon_{N_2}\ , & \Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_2}+\frac{g^2_{BL}}{2}\upsilon^2_{N_2}\ , & \frac{g^2_{BL}}{2}\upsilon_{N_2}\upsilon_{N_3}-\frac{\upsilon_{N_2}}{\upsilon_{N_3}}\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_2}\\ \frac{g^2_{BL}}{2}\upsilon_{N_1}\upsilon_{N_3}-\frac{\upsilon_{N_1}}{\upsilon_{N_3}}\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_1}\ , & \frac{g^2_{BL}}{2}\upsilon_{N_2}\upsilon_{N_3}-\frac{\upsilon_{N_2}}{\upsilon_{N_3}}\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_2}\ , & \frac{g^2_{BL}}{2}\upsilon^2_{N_3}+\frac{\upsilon^2_{N_1}\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_1}+\upsilon^2_{N_2}\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_2}}{\upsilon^2_{N_3}}\end{pmatrix} \tag{45}$$

and the concrete expressions for $\delta^2 m^{even}_{LL}$, $\delta^2 m^{even}_{LR}$ and $\delta^2 m^{even}_{RR}$ can be found in the appendix.B. Defining the orthogonal 3×3 rotation $\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c}$, we get

$$\mathcal{Z}^T_{\tilde{N}^c}M^2_{\tilde{N}^c}\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c}=\mathrm{diag}(M^2_{\tilde{\nu}^1_R}\ ,\ M^2_{\tilde{\nu}^2_R}\ ,\ M^2_{\tilde{\nu}^3_R})\ , \tag{46}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}M^2_{\tilde{\nu}^1_R}&=\frac{1}{2}m^2_{Z_{BL}}\ ,\\ M^2_{\tilde{\nu}^2_R}&=\frac{\omega_{_A}-\omega_{_B}}{2\upsilon^2_{N_3}}\ ,\\ M^2_{\tilde{\nu}^3_R}&=\frac{\omega_{_A}+\omega_{_B}}{2\upsilon^2_{N_3}}\ .\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

Additionally the orthogonal 3×3 rotation is written as

$$\begin{aligned}\begin{pmatrix}\left(\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c}\right)_{11}\\ \left(\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c}\right)_{21}\\ \left(\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c}\right)_{31}\end{pmatrix}&=\frac{1}{\upsilon_{_N}}\begin{pmatrix}\upsilon_{N_1}\\ \upsilon_{N_2}\\ \upsilon_{N_3}\end{pmatrix}\ ,\\ \begin{pmatrix}\left(\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c}\right)_{12}\\ \left(\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c}\right)_{22}\\ \left(\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c}\right)_{32}\end{pmatrix}&=\frac{1}{\sqrt{|X_-|^2+|Y_-|^2+|Z_-|^2}}\begin{pmatrix}X_-\\ Y_-\\ Z_-\end{pmatrix}\ ,\\ \begin{pmatrix}\left(\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c}\right)_{13}\\ \left(\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c}\right)_{23}\\ \left(\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c}\right)_{33}\end{pmatrix}&=\frac{1}{\sqrt{|X_+|^2+|Y_+|^2+|Z_+|^2}}\begin{pmatrix}X_+\\ Y_+\\ Z_+\end{pmatrix}\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

with

$$X_{\mp}=\frac{\upsilon_{N_3}}{\upsilon_{N_1}}\Big\{\Big[2\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_1}-g^2_{BL}(\upsilon^2_{_N}-\upsilon^2_{N_1})\Big]\Big[\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_2}(\upsilon^2_{_N}-\upsilon^2_{N_1})\pm\omega_{_B}\Big]$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-2\Lambda^4_{\tilde{N}^c_1}(\upsilon^2_{N}-\upsilon^2_{N_2})-g^2_{BL}\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_1}\upsilon^2_{N_1}\upsilon^2_{N_2}+g^2_{BL}\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_1}\upsilon^2_{N}\upsilon^2_{N_3}\Big\}\,,\\
Y_{\mp}&=\upsilon_{N_2}\upsilon_{N_3}\Big\{g^2_{BL}(\omega_{A}\pm\omega_{B})-4\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_1}\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_2}\Big\}\,,\\
Z_{\mp}&=2\Lambda^4_{\tilde{N}^c_1}(\upsilon^2_{N}-\upsilon^2_{N_2})+2\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_1}\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_2}(\upsilon^2_{N_2}-\upsilon^2_{N_3})-g^2_{BL}\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_1}(\upsilon^2_{N}+\upsilon^2_{N_2})\upsilon^2_{N_3}\\
&\quad+g^2_{BL}\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_2}(\upsilon^2_{N}-\upsilon^2_{N_1})\upsilon^2_{N_3}\mp(2\Lambda^2_{\tilde{N}^c_1}-g^2_{BL}\upsilon^2_{N_3})\omega_{B}\,.
\end{aligned}
\tag{49}
$$

To continue with our analysis on the mass spectrum and mixing in the neutral scalar sector, we assume $\max(|\upsilon_{u}\Big(A_{N}\Big)_{IJ}|,\ \ |\mu\upsilon_{d}(Y_{N})_{IJ}|,\ \ g^2_{BL}\upsilon_{L_I}\upsilon_{N_J})\ \ll\ \min(|m^2_{\tilde{L}_I}+\Delta T_{\tilde{L}}+\Big(\frac{1}{2}m^2_{\rm Z}\cos2\beta-\frac{m^2_{Z_{BL}}}{2}\Big)-M^2_{\tilde{\nu}^J_R}|)$, then obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
m^2_{S_i}&\simeq m^2_{\tilde{L}_i}+\Delta T_{\tilde{L}}+\frac{1}{2}\Big(m^2_{\rm Z}\cos2\beta-m^2_{Z_{BL}}\Big)\\
&\quad+\sum^{3}_{\alpha=1}\frac{2M^2_{\tilde{\nu}^{\alpha}_R}((\delta^2 m^{even}_{LR})\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c})_{i\alpha}}{(2M^2_{\tilde{\nu}^{\alpha}_R}-2m^2_{\tilde{L}_i}-2\Delta T_{\tilde{L}}-m^2_{\rm Z}\cos2\beta+m^2_{Z_{BL}})^2}\,,\\
m^2_{S_{(3+i)}}&\simeq M^2_{\tilde{\nu}^i_R}+\sum^{3}_{\alpha=1}\frac{(2m^2_{\tilde{L}_\alpha}+2\Delta T_{\tilde{L}}+m^2_{\rm Z}\cos2\beta-2m^2_{Z_{BL}})((\delta^2 m^{even}_{LR})\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c})_{i\alpha}}{(2M^2_{\tilde{\nu}^i_R}-2m^2_{\tilde{L}_\alpha}-2\Delta T_{\tilde{L}}-m^2_{\rm Z}\cos2\beta+m^2_{Z_{BL}})^2}\,.
\end{aligned}
\tag{50}
$$

Meanwhile, the mixing matrix Z_{S} is

$$
Z_{S}\simeq\begin{pmatrix}
[Z_{\tilde{L}}]_{3\times3}\,, & \Big[\frac{2((\delta^2 m^{even}_{LR})\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c})_{ij'}}{2M^2_{\tilde{\nu}^{j'}_R}-2m^2_{\tilde{L}_i}-2\Delta T_{\tilde{L}}-m^2_{\rm Z}\cos2\beta+m^2_{Z_{BL}}}\Big]_{3\times3}\\
-\Big[\frac{2((\delta^2 m^{even}_{LR})\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c})_{i'j}}{2M^2_{\tilde{\nu}^{\alpha}_R}-2m^2_{\tilde{L}_j}-2\Delta T_{\tilde{L}}-m^2_{\rm Z}\cos2\beta+m^2_{Z_{BL}}}\Big]_{3\times3}\,, & \Big[(\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c})_{i'j'}\Big]_{3\times3}
\end{pmatrix},
\tag{51}
$$

and the 8×8 mixing matrix is written as

$$
Z_{H_0}=\begin{pmatrix}
\Big[(Z_{R})_{ij}\Big]_{2\times2}\,, & \Big[\sum^{2}_{\alpha=1}\frac{(Z_R)_{i\alpha}(Z^T_R A_{CPE}Z_S)_{\alpha b}}{m^2_{S_b}-\lambda_\alpha}\Big]_{2\times6}\\
-\Big[\sum^{6}_{\alpha=1}\frac{(Z_S)_{a\alpha}(Z^T_S A^T_{CPE}Z_R)_{\alpha j}}{m^2_{S_\alpha}-\lambda_j}\Big]_{6\times2}\,, & \Big[(Z_S)_{ab}\Big]_{6\times6}
\end{pmatrix}.
\tag{52}
$$

Correspondingly the expression for $Z_{\tilde{L}}$ can be found in appendix .B. Then we formulate the mass squared for those CP-even neutral scalars as

$$
\begin{aligned}
m^2_{H^0_1}&\simeq\lambda_1+\sum^{6}_{\alpha=1}\frac{\Big((Z^T_R A_{CPE}Z_S)_{1\alpha}\Big)^2}{(m^2_{S_\alpha}-\lambda_1)^2}m^2_{S_\alpha}\,,\\
m^2_{H^0_2}&\simeq\lambda_2+\sum^{6}_{\alpha=1}\frac{\Big((Z^T_R A_{CPE}Z_S)_{2\alpha}\Big)^2}{(m^2_{S_\alpha}-\lambda_2)^2}m^2_{S_\alpha}\,,\\
m^2_{H^0_{(2+i)}}&\simeq m^2_{S_i}+\frac{\Big((Z^T_R A_{CPE}Z_S)_{1\alpha}\Big)^2}{(m^2_{S_\alpha}-\lambda_1)^2}\lambda_1+\frac{\Big((Z^T_R A_{CPE}Z_S)_{2\alpha}\Big)^2}{(m^2_{S_\alpha}-\lambda_2)^2}\lambda_2\,,
\end{aligned}
\tag{53}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
Z_{_R} &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos\alpha_{_H} & -\sin\alpha_{_H} \\ \sin\alpha_{_H} & \cos\alpha_{_H} \end{pmatrix} , \\
\tan 2\alpha_{_H} &= \frac{2\Big(M^2_{_{H^0}}\Big)_{12}}{\Big(M^2_{_{H^0}}\Big)_{11} - \Big(M^2_{_{H^0}}\Big)_{22}} , \\
\lambda_{1,2} &= \frac{1}{2}\Big[\Big(M^2_{_{H^0}}\Big)_{11} + \Big(M^2_{_{H^0}}\Big)_{22}\Big] \mp \sqrt{\frac{1}{4}\Big[\Big(M^2_{_{H^0}}\Big)_{11} - \Big(M^2_{_{H^0}}\Big)_{22}\Big]^2 + \Big(M^2_{_{H^0}}\Big)^2_{12}} \, . \qquad (54)
\end{aligned}
$$

One most stringent constraint on parameter space of the model is that the mass squared matrix in Eq.(36) should produce an eigenvalue around $(125\ \text{GeV})^2$ as mass squared of the lightest neutral CP-even Higgs. The current combination of the ATLAS and CMS data gives:

$$
m_{_{h^0}} = 125.9 \pm 2.1\ \text{GeV} \, , \qquad (55)
$$

this fact constrains parameter space of extensions of the SM strongly. In the MSSM, the SM-liked Higgs satisfying the condition (55) demands both relatively light scalar top quarks with large mixing, or a large mass hierarchy between two scalar top quarks in the case that one scalar top quark is light [26]. Considering the constraints from neutrino oscillation experimental data, the mixing between $H^0_{_u}$, $H^0_{_d}$ and real part of right-handed sneutrinos is only about 10^{-6} at tree level in the MSSM with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry. Nevertheless one-loop radiative corrections can enhance the mixing drastically when $A_{_t}$, $\upsilon_{_N} \geq 1$ TeV and $\tan\beta > 1$, and the corrections to mass of the lightest CP-even Higgs from this mixture increase the corresponding MSSM radiative contributions.

IV. THE MASS MATRIX FOR NEUTRALINOS AND NEUTRINOS

After the local gauge symmetry $SU(2)_{_L} \otimes U(1)_{_Y} \otimes U(1)_{_{(B-L)}}$ is broken down, the nonzero VEVs of left- and right-handed sneutrinos induce the mixing between neutralinos (charginos) and neutrinos (charged leptons). As mentioned above, the MSSM with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry naturally predicates two sterile neutrinos with sub-eV masses[15, 16]. In the basis $(\nu_{_{L_I}},\ N^c_{_J},\ i\lambda_{_{BL}},\ i\lambda_{_B},\ i\lambda^3_{_A},\ \psi^1_{_{H_d}},\ \psi^2_{_{H_u}})$, the mass matrix for neutralino-neutrino

is formulated as

$$M_{_N} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{3\times 3} & \left(\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(1)}\right)_{3\times 4} & \left(\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(2)}\right)_{3\times 4} \\ \left(\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(1)T}\right)_{4\times 3} & \left(\mathcal{M}_{_N}^{(0)}\right)_{4\times 4} & \left(\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(3)}\right)_{4\times 4} \\ \left(\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(2)T}\right)_{4\times 3} & \left(\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(3)T}\right)_{4\times 4} & \left(\mathcal{M}_{_N}\right)_{4\times 4} \end{pmatrix} , \tag{56}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{_N}$ denotes the 4×4 mass matrix for neutralinos in the MSSM, the concrete expressions for $\mathcal{M}_{_N}^{(0)}$, $\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(1)}$, $\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(2)}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(3)}$ are

$$\mathcal{M}_{_N}^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{3\times 3} & \left(g_{_{BL}}\upsilon_{_{N_{J'}}}\right)_{3\times 1} \\ \left(g_{_{BL}}\upsilon_{_{N_J}}\right)_{1\times 3} & 2m_{_{BL}} \end{pmatrix} ,$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} \left(\frac{\upsilon_{_u}}{\sqrt{2}}(Y_{_N})_{I'J}\right)_{3\times 3} & \left(-g_{_{BL}}\upsilon_{_{L_{I'}}}\right)_{3\times 1} \end{pmatrix} ,$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(2)} = & \begin{pmatrix} \left(-\frac{g_1}{2}\upsilon_{_{L_{I'}}}\right)_{3\times 1} & \left(\frac{g_2}{2}\upsilon_{_{L_{I'}}}\right)_{3\times 1} & 0_{3\times 1} & \left(\frac{\zeta_{_{I'}}}{\sqrt{2}}\right)_{3\times 1} \end{pmatrix} \\ & + \left[\Delta\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(2)}\right]_{3\times 4} ,\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(3)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{3\times 1} & 0_{3\times 1} & 0_{3\times 1} & \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}(Y_{_N})_{\alpha J}\right)_{3\times 1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \tag{57}$$

with the row indices of matrix I', $J' = 1,\ 2,\ 3$, and the column indices of matrix I, $J = 1,\ 2,\ 3$, respectively. In addition, the 3×4 matrix $\Delta\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(2)}$ represents the one-loop radiative corrections to neutrino mass matrix from virtual sneutrino-neutralino loop with relatively large $A_{_N}$ in the soft breaking terms[27]:

$$\left[\Delta\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(2)}\right]_i = \sum_{\beta=1}^{4}\left[\mathcal{N}_{_F}^{(2)}\right]_{i,\beta}\Big(s_{_{\rm W}}(U_{\chi^0})_{4\beta},\ \ -c_{_{\rm W}}(U_{\chi^0})_{4\beta},\ \ 0,\ \ \left[s_{_{\rm W}}(U_{\chi^0})_{1\beta} - c_{_{\rm W}}(U_{\chi^0})_{2\beta}\right]\Big) \tag{58}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\left[\mathcal{N}_{_F}^{(2)}\right]_{i,\beta} = & \frac{\alpha}{8\sqrt{2}\pi s_{_{\rm W}}^2 c_{_{\rm W}}^2}\left[s_{_{\rm W}}(U_{\chi^0})_{1\beta} - c_{_{\rm W}}(U_{\chi^0})_{2\beta}\right] m_{\chi_\beta^0}(A_{_N}\upsilon_{_N})_i \\ & \times\Big\{\sum_{k=1}^{2}(Z_{_R})_{1k}\varrho_{_{1,1}}(m_{\chi_\beta^0}^2,\ m_{_{H_k^0}}^2,\ m_{_{\tilde{L}_i}}^2) + \sin\beta\,\varrho_{_{0,1}}(m_{\chi_\beta^0}^2,\ m_{_{\tilde{L}_i}}^2) \\ & + \cos\beta\,\varrho_{_{1,1}}(m_{\chi_\beta^0}^2,\ m_{_{A_3^0}}^2,\ m_{_{\tilde{L}_i}}^2)\Big\}\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

where the functions $\varrho_{m,n}(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_{_N})$ are defined by

$$\varrho_{m,n}(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_{_N}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{x_i^m \ln^n x_i}{\prod\limits_{j\neq i}(x_i - x_j)} \; . \tag{60}$$

To estimate magnitudes of the radiative corrections on neutrino masses, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Big[\mathcal{N}_{_F}^{(2)}\Big]_{i,\alpha} \sim \frac{\alpha\Lambda_{_{EW}}(A_{_N}\upsilon_{_N})_i}{8\sqrt{2}\pi s_{\rm W}^2 c_{\rm W}^2 m_{\tilde{L}_i}^2} \ln\frac{m_{\tilde{L}_i}}{\Lambda_{_{EW}}}\Big[s_{\rm W}(U_{\chi^0})_{1\alpha} - c_{\rm W}(U_{\chi^0})_{2\alpha}\Big] \\ \times\Big\{\sum_{k=1}^{2}(Z_{_R})_{1k} + \sin\beta + \cos\beta\Big\}\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

as $m_{\tilde{L}_i} \gg m_{\chi_\beta^0} \simeq m_{H_k^0} \simeq m_{A_3^0} \simeq \Lambda_{_{EW}}$,where $\Lambda_{_{EW}}$ denotes the electroweak energy scale. Taking $m_{\tilde{L}_i} = \upsilon_{_{N_i}} \sim 1$ TeV, $\Lambda_{_{EW}} \sim 100$ GeV, $A_{_{N_i}} \sim 0.01$ GeV, one acquires $\Big[\mathcal{N}_{_F}^{(2)}\Big]_{i,\alpha} \sim 10^{-6}$ GeV which is negligible comparing with the tree level contributions to the 3×4 matrix $\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(2)} \sim 10^{-4}$ GeV as $\upsilon_{_{L_i}} \sim 10^{-3}$ GeV and $Y_{_N} \sim 10^{-7}$. Nevertheless, this radiative pieces account for tiny masses of the lightest active and two sterile neutrinos naturally because only two left-handed neutrinos acquire nonzero masses at tree level [15].

Defining the 4×4 orthogonal matrix

$$\mathcal{Z}_{_N}^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\upsilon_{_{N_3}}}{\sqrt{\upsilon_{_{N_1}}^2+\upsilon_{_{N_3}}^2}} & -\frac{\upsilon_{_{N_2}}}{\sqrt{\upsilon_{_{N_1}}^2+\upsilon_{_{N_2}}^2}} & -\frac{ig_{_{BL}}\upsilon_{_{N_1}}}{\sqrt{2}\Delta_{_{BL}}\eta_{_{BL}}^-} & \frac{g_{_{BL}}\upsilon_{_{N_1}}}{\sqrt{2}\Delta_{_{BL}}\eta_{_{BL}}^+} \\ 0 & \frac{\upsilon_{_{N_1}}}{\sqrt{\upsilon_{_{N_1}}^2+\upsilon_{_{N_2}}^2}} & -\frac{ig_{_{BL}}\upsilon_{_{N_2}}}{\sqrt{2}\Delta_{_{BL}}\eta_{_{BL}}^-} & \frac{g_{_{BL}}\upsilon_{_{N_2}}}{\sqrt{2}\Delta_{_{BL}}\eta_{_{BL}}^+} \\ \frac{\upsilon_{_{N_1}}}{\sqrt{\upsilon_{_{N_1}}^2+\upsilon_{_{N_3}}^2}} & 0 & -\frac{ig_{_{BL}}\upsilon_{_{N_3}}}{\sqrt{2}\Delta_{_{BL}}\eta_{_{BL}}^-} & \frac{g_{_{BL}}\upsilon_{_{N_3}}}{\sqrt{2}\Delta_{_{BL}}\eta_{_{BL}}^+} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\eta_{_{BL}}^- & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\eta_{_{BL}}^+ \end{pmatrix}, \tag{62}$$

one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}&\begin{pmatrix} 1_{3\times 3}, & 0_{3\times 4} & 0_{3\times 4} \\ 0_{4\times 3} & \Big(\mathcal{Z}_{_N}^{(0)T}\Big)_{4\times 4} & 0_{4\times 4} \\ 0_{4\times 3} & 0_{4\times 4} & 1_{4\times 4} \end{pmatrix}\cdot M_{_N}\cdot\begin{pmatrix} 1_{3\times 3}, & 0_{3\times 4} & 0_{3\times 4} \\ 0_{4\times 3} & \Big(\mathcal{Z}_{_N}^{(0)}\Big)_{4\times 4} & 0_{4\times 4} \\ 0_{4\times 3} & 0_{4\times 4} & 1_{4\times 4} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0_{3\times 3} & \Big(\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(1)}\mathcal{Z}_{_N}^{(0)}\Big)_{3\times 4} & \Big(\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(2)}\Big)_{3\times 4} \\ \Big(\mathcal{Z}_{_N}^{(0)T}\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(1)T}\Big)_{4\times 3} & \Big(\mathcal{Z}_{_N}^{(0)T}\mathcal{M}_{_N}^{(0)}\mathcal{Z}_{_N}^{(0)}\Big)_{4\times 4} & \Big(\mathcal{Z}_{_N}^{(0)T}\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(3)}\Big)_{4\times 4} \\ \Big(\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(2)T}\Big)_{4\times 3} & \Big(\mathcal{A}_{_N}^{(3)T}\mathcal{Z}_{_N}^{(0)}\Big)_{4\times 4} & \Big(\mathcal{M}_{_N}\Big)_{4\times 4} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \Big(m_\nu\Big)_{5\times 5} & \Big(m_{_D}\Big)_{5\times 6} \\ \Big(m_{_D}^T\Big)_{6\times 5} & \Big(\mathcal{M}\Big)_{6\times 6} \end{pmatrix} \; . \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

Where $\Delta_{BL}=\sqrt{m_{BL}^2+g_{BL}^2\upsilon_N^2}$, $\eta_{BL}^{\pm}=\sqrt{1\pm\frac{m_{BL}}{\Delta_{BL}}}$, and $\mathcal{Z}_N^{(0)T}\mathcal{M}_N^{(0)}\mathcal{Z}_N^{(0)}=diag(0,\ \ 0,\ \ \Delta_{BL}-m_{BL},\ \ \Delta_{BL}+m_{BL})$, respectively.

Using Eq.(56) and Eq.(62), we formulate the submatrices in Eq.(63) respectively as

$$\mathcal{M}=\begin{pmatrix} \Delta_{BL}-m_{BL} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -i\varepsilon_- \\ 0 & \Delta_{BL}+m_{BL} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \varepsilon_+ \\ 0 & 0 & 2m_1 & 0 & -\frac{g_1\upsilon_d}{2} & \frac{g_1\upsilon_u}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2m_2 & \frac{g_2\upsilon_d}{2} & -\frac{g_2\upsilon_u}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{g_1\upsilon_d}{2} & \frac{g_2\upsilon_d}{2} & 0 & \mu \\ -i\varepsilon_- & \varepsilon_+ & \frac{g_1\upsilon_u}{2} & -\frac{g_2\upsilon_u}{2} & \mu & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$m_D=\begin{pmatrix} -i\delta_1^- & \delta_1^+ & \left[\mathcal{A}_N^{(2)}\right]_{1,1} & \left[\mathcal{A}_N^{(2)}\right]_{1,2} & 0 & \left[\mathcal{A}_N^{(2)}\right]_{1,4} \\ -i\delta_2^- & \delta_2^+ & \left[\mathcal{A}_N^{(2)}\right]_{2,1} & \left[\mathcal{A}_N^{(2)}\right]_{2,2} & 0 & \left[\mathcal{A}_N^{(2)}\right]_{2,4} \\ -i\delta_3^- & \delta_3^+ & \left[\mathcal{A}_N^{(2)}\right]_{3,1} & \left[\mathcal{A}_N^{(2)}\right]_{3,2} & 0 & \left[\mathcal{A}_N^{(2)}\right]_{3,4} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \varepsilon_{13} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \varepsilon_{12} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$m_\nu=\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \delta_{13} & \delta_{12} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \delta_{23} & \delta_{22} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \delta_{33} & \delta_{32} \\ \delta_{13} & \delta_{23} & \delta_{33} & 0 & 0 \\ \delta_{12} & \delta_{22} & \delta_{32} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{64}$$

where the abbreviations are

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_\pm &= \frac{g_{BL}\varepsilon_N^2}{2\Delta_{BL}\eta_{BL}^\pm}\ , \\ \delta_{i2} &= \frac{\upsilon_u}{\sqrt{2(\upsilon_{N_1}^2+\upsilon_{N_2}^2)}}\Big[-\left(Y_N\right)_{i1}\upsilon_{N_2}+\left(Y_N\right)_{i2}\upsilon_{N_1}\Big]\ , \\ \delta_{i3} &= \frac{\upsilon_u}{\sqrt{2(\upsilon_{N_1}^2+\upsilon_{N_3}^2)}}\Big[-\left(Y_N\right)_{i1}\upsilon_{N_3}+\left(Y_N\right)_{i3}\upsilon_{N_1}\Big]\ , \\ \varepsilon_{12} &= \frac{1}{\upsilon_u}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{L_\alpha}\delta_{\alpha 2}\ , \\ \varepsilon_{13} &= \frac{1}{\upsilon_u}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{L_\alpha}\delta_{\alpha 3}\ , \end{aligned}$$

$$\delta_i^{\pm} = \frac{g_{_{BL}} \upsilon_{_u}}{\sqrt{2}\Delta_{_{BL}} \eta_{_{BL}}^{\pm}} \zeta_i \mp \frac{g_{_{BL}} \eta_{_{BL}}^{\pm}}{\sqrt{2}} \upsilon_{_{L_i}} \ . \tag{65}$$

Defining a 11×11 approximated orthogonal transformation matrix $\mathcal{Z}_{_N}$

$$\mathcal{Z}_{_N} = \begin{pmatrix} \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} m_{_D} \cdot \mathcal{M}^{-2} \cdot m_{_D}^T\right]_{5\times5} & \left[m_{_D} \cdot \mathcal{M}^{-1} + m_{\nu} \cdot m_{_D} \cdot \mathcal{M}^{-2}\right]_{5\times6} \\ -\left[\mathcal{M}^{-1} \cdot m_{_D}^T + \mathcal{M}^{-2} \cdot m_{_D}^T \cdot m_{\nu}\right]_{6\times5} & \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{M}^{-1} \cdot m_{_D}^T \cdot m_{_D} \cdot \mathcal{M}^{-1}\right]_{6\times6} \end{pmatrix} , \tag{66}$$

we finally write the effective mass matrix for five light neutrinos (three active and two sterile) as

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\nu}^{eff} &\simeq m_{\nu} - m_{_D} \cdot \mathcal{M}^{-1} \cdot m_{_D}^T - \frac{1}{2} m_{\nu} \cdot m_{_D} \cdot \mathcal{M}^{-2} \cdot m_{_D}^T - \frac{1}{2} m_{_D} \cdot \mathcal{M}^{-2} \cdot m_{_D}^T \cdot m_{\nu} \\ &\simeq \begin{pmatrix} \left[M_{\nu}^{LL}\right]_{3\times3} & \left[M_{\nu}^{LR}\right]_{3\times2} \\ \left[M_{\nu}^{LR,T}\right]_{2\times3} & \left[M_{\nu}^{RR}\right]_{2\times2} \end{pmatrix} . \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

In order to accommodate naturally the experimental data on neutrino oscillation and Z invisible decay width in this framework, we find that only one possibility $M_{\nu}^{LL} \gg M_{\nu}^{LR},\ M_{\nu}^{RR}$ is reasonable [15]. In fact, this point implies

$$\delta_{i2},\ \delta_{i3} \ll \left[M_{\nu}^{LL}\right]_{ii} . \tag{68}$$

Three active neutrinos with sub-eV masses require $\max(\upsilon_{_{L_i}}, \zeta_j) < 10^{-2}$GeV, where $i,\ j = 1,\ 2,\ 3$ are the generation indices.

To guarantee decoupling two light sterile neutrinos from the active ones, we choose the Yukawa couplings for right-handed neutrinos as

$$Y_{_N} = \frac{1}{\upsilon_{_N}} \begin{pmatrix} \upsilon_{_{N_1}} Y_1,\ \upsilon_{_{N_2}} Y_1,\ \upsilon_{_{N_3}} Y_1 \\ \upsilon_{_{N_1}} Y_2,\ \upsilon_{_{N_2}} Y_2,\ \upsilon_{_{N_3}} Y_2 \\ \upsilon_{_{N_1}} Y_3,\ \upsilon_{_{N_2}} Y_3,\ \upsilon_{_{N_3}} Y_3 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\upsilon_{_N}} \begin{pmatrix} Y_1,\ 0,\ 0 \\ 0,\ Y_2,\ 0 \\ 0,\ 0,\ Y_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \upsilon_{_{N_1}},\ \upsilon_{_{N_2}},\ \upsilon_{_{N_3}} \\ \upsilon_{_{N_1}},\ \upsilon_{_{N_2}},\ \upsilon_{_{N_3}} \\ \upsilon_{_{N_1}},\ \upsilon_{_{N_2}},\ \upsilon_{_{N_3}} \end{pmatrix} , \tag{69}$$

then get

$$\zeta_i = Y_i \upsilon_{_N} \ ,\ \delta_{i2} = \delta_{i3} = 0 \ , \quad (i = 1,\ 2,\ 3) . \tag{70}$$

Adopting the assumption on relevant parameter space, only two left-handed neutrinos acquire nonzero masses at tree level. Two sterile neutrinos and another active left-handed

neutrino acquire their physical masses after we consider radiative corrections to the neutrino mass matrix in Eq.(67).

In the case of three active neutrino mixing, so far the available measurements on the neutrino oscillations can determine the neutrino mass spectrum up to two possible solutions:

- the normal ordering (NO) spectrum:

$$m_{\nu_1} < m_{\nu_2} < m_{\nu_3},\ \Delta m^2_{_A} = \Delta m^2_{_{31}},\ \Delta m^2_{_\odot} = \Delta m^2_{_{21}}; \tag{71}$$

- the inverted ordering (IO) spectrum:

$$m_{\nu_3} < m_{\nu_1} < m_{\nu_2},\ \Delta m^2_{_A} = \Delta m^2_{_{23}},\ \Delta m^2_{_\odot} = \Delta m^2_{_{13}}. \tag{72}$$

The flavor neutrinos are mixed into massive neutrinos $\nu_{1,2,3}$ during their flight, and the mixings are described by the Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata matrix $U_{_{PMNS}}$ [28, 29]:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sin\theta_{13} = \left|\left(U_{_{PMNS}}\right)_{13}\right|, \quad \cos\theta_{13} = \sqrt{1-\left|\left(U_{_{PMNS}}\right)_{13}\right|^2}\ , \\
&\sin\theta_{23} = \frac{\left|\left(U_{_{PMNS}}\right)_{23}\right|}{\sqrt{1-\left|\left(U_{_{PMNS}}\right)_{13}\right|^2}}\ , \quad \cos\theta_{23} = \frac{\left|\left(U_{_{PMNS}}\right)_{33}\right|}{\sqrt{1-\left|\left(U_{_{PMNS}}\right)_{13}\right|^2}}\ , \\
&\sin\theta_{12} = \frac{\left|\left(U_{_{PMNS}}\right)_{12}\right|}{\sqrt{1-\left|\left(U_{_{PMNS}}\right)_{13}\right|^2}}\ , \quad \cos\theta_{12} = \frac{\left|\left(U_{_{PMNS}}\right)_{11}\right|}{\sqrt{1-\left|\left(U_{_{PMNS}}\right)_{13}\right|^2}}\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Through several recent reactor oscillation experiments [7, 30–33], the mixing angle θ_{13} is now precisely known. The global fit of θ_{13} gives [34]

$$\sin^2\theta_{13} = 0.023 \pm 0.0023\ , \tag{74}$$

and other experimental observations relating solar and atmospheric neutrino oscillations are shown as[19]

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta m^2_{_\odot} = 7.58^{+0.22}_{-0.26}\times 10^{-5}\mathrm{eV}^2, \\
&\Delta m^2_{_A} = 2.35^{+0.12}_{-0.09}\times 10^{-3}\mathrm{eV}^2, \\
&\sin^2\theta_{_\odot} = 0.306^{+0.018}_{-0.015}\ , \qquad \sin^2\theta_{_A} = 0.42^{+0.08}_{-0.03}\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

In addition, the cosmological observations also constrain the light neutrino masses strongly. The WMAP collaboration gets an upper bound on the sum of neutrino masses as $\sum m_\nu \leq 0.44$ eV from nine-year Wilkinson microwave anisotropy probe data [35], and the Planck collaboration derives a more stringent bound on the sum of neutrino masses as $\sum m_\nu \leq 0.23$ eV through the measurements of the cosmic microwave background temperature and lensing-potential power spectra [36]. In our analysis, we consider the constraint from the Planck collaboration on the sum of neutrino masses.

Considering extra minus in definition of μ-parameter and only including the leading terms in Eq.(67), our result is consistent with Eq.(4.5) in literature [12]. One easily finds that the parameters Y_i $(i = 1,\ 2,\ 3)$ are the Yukawa couplings Y_ν^{i3}, and $\delta_{i2},\ \delta_{i3}$ are the Yukawa couplings $Y_\nu^{i\alpha}$ $(\alpha = 1,\ 2)$ in literature [12] where only the third generation right-handed scalar neutrino acquires nonzero VEV. Choosing the Yukawa couplings for right-handed neutrinos in Eq.(69), we derive that there is no mixings between three active and two light sterile neutrinos since $\delta_{i2} \simeq 0,\ \delta_{i3} \simeq 0$. In order to satisfy the experimental bounds on active neutrino masses, one also numerically finds that the allowed values for Y_i in the range $(10^{-7},\ 10^{-5})$ as the VEVs of left-handed scalar neutrinos change in the region $(10^{-5},\ 10^{-2})$ GeV. This conclusion also coincides with the corresponding result quantitatively in literature [12]. Assuming that the parameters $\mu,\ \upsilon_{_N},\ m_{_{Z_{BL}}},\ m_{_{BL}}$ are all exceed TeV scale and taking $m_1 = 200$ GeV, $m_2 = 400$ GeV, one finds $\tilde{m} \simeq 129$ GeV and $1/\Lambda_\upsilon \simeq -2 \times 10^{-4}$ GeV^{-1}. Choosing $\upsilon_{_L} \sim 10^{-3}$ GeV, we derive that the magnitude to neutrino mass from the terms $\upsilon_{_{L_i}}\upsilon_{_{L_j}}/\Lambda_\upsilon$ is about 0.1 eV.

V. THE MASS MATRIX FOR CHARGINOS AND CHARGED LEPTONS

The mass terms of charginos are written as

$$-\mathcal{L}_{_{charginos}} = \left(e^-_{_{L_I}},\ i\lambda^-_{_A},\ \psi^2_{_{H_d}} \right) \mathcal{M}_c \begin{pmatrix} e^+_{_{R_J}} \\ i\lambda^+_{_A} \\ \psi^1_{_{H_u}} \end{pmatrix} + h.c. \tag{76}$$

with

$$\mathcal{M}_c = \begin{pmatrix} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(Y_{_E}\right)_{IJ}\upsilon_{_d}\right]_{3\times 3}, & E_{3\times 2} \\ E'_{2\times 3}, & \mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{\pm} \end{pmatrix} . \tag{77}$$

Here $\mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{\pm}$ denotes the chargino mass matrix in the MSSM

$$\mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{\pm} = \begin{pmatrix} 2m_2, & \frac{ev_{_u}}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}} \\ \frac{ev_{_d}}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}}, & -\mu \end{pmatrix} , \tag{78}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{g_2}{\sqrt{2}}\upsilon_{_{L_1}}, & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\zeta_1 \\ \frac{g_2}{\sqrt{2}}\upsilon_{_{L_2}}, & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\zeta_2 \\ \frac{g_2}{\sqrt{2}}\upsilon_{_{L_3}}, & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\zeta_3 \end{pmatrix} , \\ E' &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\sum\limits_{\alpha=1}^{3}\frac{\upsilon_{L_\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}}\left(Y_{_E}\right)_{\alpha 1} & -\sum\limits_{\alpha=1}^{3}\frac{\upsilon_{L_\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}}\left(Y_{_E}\right)_{\alpha 2} & -\sum\limits_{\alpha=1}^{3}\frac{\upsilon_{L_\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}}\left(Y_{_E}\right)_{\alpha 3} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

Because $\max\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(Y_{_E})_{ij}\upsilon_{_d},\ E_{i,\alpha},\ E'_{\beta,j}\right] \ll \min\left[\mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{\pm}\right]$ $(i.j = 1,\ 2,\ 3,\quad \alpha,\ \beta = 1,\ 2)$, we diagonalize $\mathcal{M}_c$ through two unitary matrices[37]

$$\mathcal{Z}_- \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \left[1-\frac{1}{2}\xi^T_{_L}\xi_{_L}\right]_{3\times 3}, & \left[-\xi^T_{_L}\right]_{3\times 2} \\ \left[\xi_{_L}\right]_{2\times 3}, & \left[1-\frac{1}{2}\xi_{_L}\xi^T_{_L}\right]_{2\times 2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} V_{_L} & 0 \\ 0 & U_- \end{pmatrix} , \tag{80}$$

and

$$\mathcal{Z}_+ \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \left[1-\frac{1}{2}\xi^T_{_R}\xi_{_R}\right]_{3\times 3}, & \left[-\xi^T_{_R}\right]_{3\times 2} \\ \left[\xi_{_R}\right]_{2\times 3}, & \left[1-\frac{1}{2}\xi_{_R}\xi^T_{_R}\right]_{2\times 2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} V_{_R} & 0 \\ 0 & U_+ \end{pmatrix} . \tag{81}$$

Expanding the corresponding matrices in powers of $\upsilon_{_{L_i}}/\upsilon_{_{EW}}$ etc. to the second order, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{_L} &\simeq -\left(\mathcal{M}^{(0),T}_{\pm}\right)^{-1}\cdot E^T - \frac{\upsilon_{_d}}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\mathcal{M}^{(0),T}_{\pm}\right)^{-1}\cdot\left(\mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{\pm}\right)^{-1}\cdot E'\cdot Y_{_E} , \\ \xi_{_R} &\simeq -\left(\mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{\pm}\right)^{-1}\cdot E' - \frac{\upsilon_{_d}}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\mathcal{M}^{(0)}_{\pm}\right)^{-1}\cdot\left(\mathcal{M}^{(0),T}_{\pm}\right)^{-1}\cdot E^T\cdot Y_{_E} . \end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

Using above equations, one can check that there is no mixing between charged leptons and charginos in the matrix $\mathcal{Z}^T_-\cdot\mathcal{M}_c\cdot\mathcal{Z}_+$ to the second order of $\upsilon_{_{L_i}}/\upsilon_{_{EW}}$ etc. For convenience,

we write the elements of $\xi_{L,R}$ explicitly as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big(\xi_{_L}\Big)_{1I} &= -\frac{1}{\Delta_c}\Big\{\frac{e\mu\upsilon_{_{L_I}}}{\sqrt{2}s_{_{\rm W}}} - \frac{e\upsilon_{_d}}{2s_{_{\rm W}}}\zeta_{_I} \\
&\quad + \frac{e\upsilon_{_d}(2m_2\upsilon_{_u} - \mu\upsilon_{_d})}{2\sqrt{2}s_{_{\rm W}}\Delta_c}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}\Big(Y_{_E}Y_{_E}^{T}\Big)_{\alpha I}\Big\}\,, \\
\Big(\xi_{_L}\Big)_{2I} &= -\frac{1}{\Delta_c}\Big\{\frac{e^2\upsilon_{_u}\upsilon_{_{L_I}}}{2s_{_{\rm W}}^2} + \sqrt{2}m_2\zeta_{_I} \\
&\quad - \frac{\upsilon_{_d}(8s_{_{\rm W}}m_2 + e^2\upsilon_{_u}^2)}{4s_{_{\rm W}}^2\Delta_c}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}\Big(Y_{_E}Y_{_E}^{T}\Big)_{\alpha I}\Big\}\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big(\xi_{_R}\Big)_{1I} &= \frac{1}{\Delta_c}\Big\{\Big[\frac{e\upsilon_{_u}}{2s_{_{\rm W}}} - \frac{e\upsilon_{_d}(2s_{_{\rm W}}^2\mu^2 + e^2\upsilon_{_u}^2)}{4s_{_{\rm W}}^2\Delta_c}\Big]\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}\Big(Y_{_E}\Big)_{\alpha I} \\
&\quad - \frac{e\upsilon_{_d}(2s_{_{\rm W}}^2\mu^2 + e^2\upsilon_{_u}^2)}{4s_{_{\rm W}}^2\Delta_c}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{_{N_\alpha}}\Big(Y_{_N}^{T}Y_{_E}\Big)_{\alpha I}\Big\}\,, \\
\Big(\xi_{_R}\Big)_{2I} &= -\frac{1}{\Delta_c}\Big\{\Big[\sqrt{2}m_2 - \frac{e^2\upsilon_{_d}(2m_2\upsilon_{_u} - \mu\upsilon_{_d})}{2\sqrt{2}s_{_{\rm W}}^2\Delta_c}\Big]\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}\Big(Y_{_E}\Big)_{\alpha I} \\
&\quad - \frac{\upsilon_{_d}(8s_{_{\rm W}}^2m_2^2 + e^2\upsilon_{_d}^2)}{4s_{_{\rm W}}^2\Delta_c}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{_{N_\alpha}}\Big(Y_{_N}^{T}Y_{_E}\Big)_{\alpha I}\Big\}\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

Here, $I = 1,\ 2,\ 3$ and $\Delta_c = 2m_2\mu + e^2\upsilon_{_u}\upsilon_{_d}/(2s_{_{\rm W}}^2)$. Considering corrections from the mixing between charged leptons and charginos, we approximate the elements of 3×3 mass matrix for charged leptons as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big(m_{_E}\Big)_{IJ} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(Y_{_E}\Big)_{IJ}\upsilon_{_d} - \frac{e^2\upsilon_{_u}}{2\sqrt{2}s_{_{\rm W}}^2\Delta_c}\upsilon_{_{L_I}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}\Big(Y_{_E}\Big)_{\alpha J} \\
&\quad - \frac{m_2}{\Delta_c}\zeta_{_I}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}\Big(Y_{_E}\Big)_{\alpha J}\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

Similarly, the elements of 2×2 mass matrix for charginos are approached as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big(\mathcal{M}_{\pm}\Big)_{11} &= 2m_2 + \frac{e^2\mu}{4s_{_{\rm W}}^2\Delta_c}(\upsilon_{_{\rm EW}}^2 - \upsilon_{_{\rm SM}}^2) - \frac{e^2\upsilon_{_d}\varepsilon_{_N}^2}{4\sqrt{2}s_{_{\rm W}}^2\Delta_c}\,, \\
\Big(\mathcal{M}_{\pm}\Big)_{12} &= \frac{e\upsilon_{_u}}{\sqrt{2}s_{_{\rm W}}} - \frac{e\mu\varepsilon_{_N}^2}{4s_{_{\rm W}}\Delta_c} - \frac{e\upsilon_{_d}\zeta^2}{4\sqrt{2}s_{_{\rm W}}\Delta_c}\,, \\
\Big(\mathcal{M}_{\pm}\Big)_{21} &= \frac{e\upsilon_{_d}}{\sqrt{2}s_{_{\rm W}}} + \frac{e^3\upsilon_{_u}}{4\sqrt{2}s_{_{\rm W}}^3\Delta_c}(\upsilon_{_{\rm EW}}^2 - \upsilon_{_{\rm SM}}^2) + \frac{em_2\varepsilon_{_N}^2}{4s_{_{\rm W}}\Delta_c}
\end{aligned}$$

$$+\frac{e\upsilon_{_u}}{4\sqrt{2}s_{_{\rm W}}\Delta_c}\sum_{\alpha,\beta}^{3}\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}\Big(Y_{_E}Y_{_E}^{T}\Big)_{\alpha\beta}\upsilon_{_{L_\beta}}\ ,$$

$$\Big(\mathcal{M}_{\pm}\Big)_{22}=-\mu-\frac{e^2\upsilon_{_u}\varepsilon_{_N}^2}{4\sqrt{2}s_{_{\rm W}}^2\Delta_c}-\frac{m_2\zeta^2}{2\Delta_c}-\frac{m_2}{2\Delta_c}\sum_{\alpha,\beta}^{3}\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}\Big(Y_{_E}Y_{_E}^{T}\Big)_{\alpha\beta}\upsilon_{_{L_\beta}}\ . \tag{86}$$

Furthermore, the submatrices $V_{_{L,R}}$ and $U_{\pm}$ respectively diagonalize $m_{_E}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\pm}$ in the following manner

$$\begin{aligned}&V_{_L}^{T}\cdot m_{_E}\cdot V_{_R}=diag\Big(m_e,\ m_\mu,\ m_\tau\Big)\ ,\\&U_{_-}^{T}\cdot\mathcal{M}_{\pm}\cdot U_{+}=diag\Big(m_{_{\chi_1^{\pm}}},\ m_{_{\chi_2^{\pm}}}\Big)\ .\end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

In numerical analyses we choose $Y_{_E}=\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\upsilon_{_d}}{\rm diag}(m_e,\ m_\mu,\ m_\tau)$ for simplicity, then get $V_{_L}\simeq V_{_R}\simeq 1_{3\times3}$. Taking $m_2\sim\mu\sim 100$ GeV, $\upsilon_{_{N_i}}\sim 1$ TeV, $Y_{_N}\sim 10^{-6}$ and $\upsilon_{_{L_i}}\sim 10^{-3}$ GeV, one acquires $\Big(m_{_E}\Big)_{11}\simeq m_e(1-10^{-10}\tan\beta)$, $\Big(m_{_E}\Big)_{12}\simeq -10^{-10}m_\mu\tan\beta$, $\Big(m_{_E}\Big)_{13}\simeq -10^{-10}m_\tau\tan\beta$ etc. In other words the corrections to lepton masses from next to leading terms are negligible.

Certainly the experimental observables on lepton flavor violation processes such as $\mu\to e\gamma$ constrain the R-parity violating parameters strongly. Generally the decay width of $\mu\to e\gamma$ is written as [38]

$$\Gamma(e_{_I}\to e_{_J}\gamma)=\frac{\alpha}{4}m_{e_I}^3\Big[|(A_{_L})_{_{IJ}}|^2+|(A_{_R})_{_{IJ}}|^2\Big]\ , \tag{88}$$

where the Wilson coefficients $(A_{_L})_{_{IJ}}$, $(A_{_R})_{_{IJ}}$ are extracted from the effective Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff}^{e_I\to e_J\gamma}=\frac{e}{2}\bar{e}_{_J}\sigma_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}\Big[(A_{_L})_{_{IJ}}\omega_-+(A_{_R})_{_{IJ}}\omega_+\Big]e_{_I}\ , \tag{89}$$

with $\omega_{\mp}=(1\mp\gamma_5)/2$.

For simplicity we assume that those relevant soft breaking parameters $m_{\tilde{L}}^2$, $m_{\tilde{E}}^2$, $A_{_E}$, $A_{_N}$ are flavor conservation, i.e. $(m_{\tilde{L}}^2)_{_{IJ}}=(m_{\tilde{E}}^2)_{_{IJ}}=(A_{_E})_{_{IJ}}=(A_{_N})_{_{IJ}}=0$ as $I\neq J$. Under this assumption, the lepton flavor violating processes are only induced by the R-parity violating couplings in this model. In mass basis we expand relevant couplings in powers of $\upsilon_{_{L_i}}/\upsilon_{_{EW}}$ etc. to the second order, and present the concrete expressions of interactions in appendix.D in the t'Hooft-Feynman gauge with $\xi=1$. Then the transition $\mu\to e\gamma$ is evoked by the following pieces.

- The interactions between CP-even Higgs and charginos/charged leptons, the corresponding Wilson coefficients are written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
(A^1_{_L})_{_{IJ}} = & \frac{m_{_{e_I}}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}[\delta\xi^m_1]_{_{iJ\alpha}}[\delta\xi^m_1]^*_{_{iI\alpha}} f_1(x_{_{H^0_i}}, x_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}}) \\
& + \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} m_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}}[\delta\xi^m_1]_{_{iJ\alpha}}[\delta\xi^m_2]_{_{i\alpha I}} f_2(x_{_{H^0_i}}, x_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}}) \\
& + \frac{m_{_{e_I}}}{\sqrt{2}(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\Big[(U_-)_{_{2\alpha}}(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{_{KJ}}[\delta^2\xi^m_1]^*_{_{(2+K)I\alpha}} \\
& + (U_-)^*_{_{2\alpha}}(Y_{_E}V_{_R})^*_{_{KI}}[\delta^2\xi^m_1]_{_{(2+K)J\alpha}}\Big] f_1(x_{_{H^0_{2+K}}}, x_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}}) \\
& + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} m_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}}\Big[(U_-)_{_{2\alpha}}(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{_{KJ}}[\delta^2\xi^m_2]_{_{(2+K)\alpha I}} \\
& + \frac{e}{s_{_{\rm W}}}(U_+)_{_{1\alpha}}(V_{_L})_{_{KI}}[\delta^2\xi^m_1]_{_{(2+K)J\alpha}}\Big] f_2(x_{_{H^0_{2+K}}}, x_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}}) \\
& - \frac{\sqrt{2}m^2_{_{e_I}}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2\upsilon_{_d}}\sum_{i=1}^{2}(Z_{_R})_{_{2i}}\Big[[\delta^2\xi^e_1]^*_{_{iJI}} f_1(x_{_{H^0_i}}, 0) + [\delta^2\xi^e_1]_{_{iJI}} f_2(x_{_{H^0_i}}, 0)\Big] \\
& + \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\Big[m_{_{e_I}}[\delta\xi^e_1]_{_{(2+K)II'}}[\delta\xi^e_1]^*_{_{(2+K)JI'}} f_1(x_{_{H^0_{2+K}}}, 0) \\
& + m_{_{e_{I'}}}[\delta\xi^e_1]_{_{(2+K)II'}}[\delta\xi^e_1]_{_{(2+K)I'J}} f_2(x_{_{H^0_{2+K}}}, 0)\Big] , \\
(A^1_{_R})_{_{IJ}} = & \frac{m_{_{e_I}}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}[\delta\xi^m_2]^*_{_{i\alpha J}}[\delta\xi^m_2]_{_{i\alpha I}} f_1(x_{_{H^0_i}}, x_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}}) \\
& + \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} m_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}}[\delta\xi^m_2]^*_{_{i\alpha J}}[\delta\xi^m_1]^*_{_{iI\alpha}} f_2(x_{_{H^0_i}}, x_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}}) \\
& + \frac{em_{_{e_I}}}{\sqrt{2}(4\pi)^2 s_{_{\rm W}}\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\Big[(U_+)^*_{_{1\alpha}}(V_{_L})^*_{_{KJ}}[\delta^2\xi^m_2]^*_{_{(2+K)\alpha I}} \\
& + (U_+)_{_{1\alpha}}(V_{_L})_{_{KI}}[\delta^2\xi^m_2]^*_{_{(2+K)\alpha J}}\Big] f_1(x_{_{H^0_{2+K}}}, x_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}}) \\
& + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} m_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}}\Big[(U_-)^*_{_{2\alpha}}(Y_{_E}V_{_R})^*_{_{KI}}[\delta^2\xi^m_2]_{_{(2+K)\alpha J}} \\
& + \frac{e}{s_{_{\rm W}}}(U_+)^*_{_{1\alpha}}(V_{_L})^*_{_{KJ}}[\delta^2\xi^m_1]^*_{_{(2+K)I\alpha}}\Big] f_2(x_{_{H^0_{2+K}}}, x_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}}) \\
& + \frac{m_{_{e_I}}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}[\delta\xi^m_2]^*_{_{(5+K)\alpha J}}[\delta\xi^m_2]_{_{(5+K)\alpha I}} f_1(x_{_{H^0_{5+K}}}, x_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}})
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{\sqrt{2}m_{e_I}^2}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2 v_d}\sum_{i=1}^{2}(Z_R)_{2i}^{*}\Big[[\delta^2\xi_1^e]_{iJI}f_1(x_{H_i^0},0)+[\delta^2\xi_1^e]_{iJI}^{*}f_2(x_{H_i^0},0)\Big]\\
&+\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\Big[m_{e_I}[\delta\xi_1^e]_{(2+K)I'I}^{*}[\delta\xi_1^e]_{(2+K)I'J}f_1(x_{H_{2+K}^0},0)\\
&+m_{e_{I'}}[\delta\xi_1^e]_{(2+K)I'I}^{*}[\delta\xi_1^e]_{(2+K)JI'}^{*}f_2(x_{H_{2+K}^0},0)\Big]\ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{90}
$$

where Λ denotes the matching scale between full theory and effective one, $x_i=m_i^2/\Lambda^2$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_1(x,y)&=\Big[\frac{1}{12}\frac{\partial^3\varrho_{3,1}}{\partial x^3}-\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2\varrho_{2,1}}{\partial x^2}+\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial\varrho_{1,1}}{\partial x}\Big](x,y)\ ,\\
f_2(x,y)&=\Big[\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2\varrho_{2,1}}{\partial x^2}-\frac{\partial\varrho_{1,1}}{\partial x}+\frac{\partial\varrho_{1,1}}{\partial y}\Big](x,y)\ .
\end{aligned}
\tag{91}
$$

Those concrete expressions for lepton number violating couplings are collected in appendix.(D).

- The interactions between CP-odd Higgs and charginos/charged leptons, the corresponding Wilson coefficients are formulated as

$$
\begin{aligned}
(A_L^2)_{IJ}=&\frac{m_{e_I}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{i=1,3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}[\delta\eta_1^m]_{iJ\alpha}[\delta\eta_1^m]_{iI\alpha}^{*}f_1(x_{A_i^0},x_{\chi_\alpha^\pm})\\
&-\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{i=1,3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}m_{\chi_\alpha^\pm}[\delta\eta_1^m]_{iJ\alpha}[\delta\eta_2^m]_{i\alpha I}f_2(x_{A_i^0},x_{\chi_\alpha^\pm})\\
&+\frac{m_{e_I}}{\sqrt{2}(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\Big[(U_-)_{2\alpha}(Y_E V_R)_{KJ}[\delta^2\eta_1^m]_{(3+K)I\alpha}^{*}\\
&+(U_-)_{2\alpha}^{*}(Y_E V_R)_{KI}^{*}[\delta^2\eta_1^m]_{(3+K)J\alpha}\Big]f_1(x_{A_{3+K}^0},x_{\chi_\alpha^\pm})\\
&-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}m_{\chi_\alpha^\pm}\Big[(U_-)_{2\alpha}(Y_E V_R)_{KJ}[\delta^2\eta_2^m]_{(3+K)\alpha I}\\
&+\frac{e}{s_{\rm W}}(U_+)_{1\alpha}(V_L)_{KI}[\delta^2\eta_1^m]_{(3+K)J\alpha}\Big]f_2(x_{A_{3+K}^0},x_{\chi_\alpha^\pm})\\
&+\frac{m_{e_I}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}[\delta\eta_1^m]_{(6+i)J\alpha}[\delta\eta_1^m]_{(6+i)I\alpha}f_1(x_{A_{6+i}^0},x_{\chi_\alpha^\pm})\\
&-\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}m_{\chi_\alpha^\pm}[\delta\eta_1^m]_{(6+i)J\alpha}[\delta\eta_2^m]_{(6+i)\alpha I}f_2(x_{A_{6+i}^0},x_{\chi_\alpha^\pm})
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{\sqrt{2}m^2_{e_I}\cos\beta}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2\upsilon_d}\Big\{[\delta^2\eta^e]_{1JI}f_1(x_{_Z},0)-[\delta^2\eta^e]^*_{1IJ}f_2(x_{_Z},0)\Big\}\\
&-\frac{\sqrt{2}m^2_{e_I}\sin\beta}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2\upsilon_d}\Big\{[\delta^2\eta^e]_{3JI}f_1(x_{_{A^0_3}},0)-[\delta^2\eta^e]^*_{3IJ}f_2(x_{_{A^0_3}},0)\Big\}\,,\\
(A^2_{_R})_{IJ}=&\frac{m_{e_I}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{i=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}[\delta\eta^m_2]^*_{i\alpha J}[\delta\eta^m_2]_{i\alpha I}f_1(x_{_{A^0_i}},x_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}})\\
&-\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{i=1,3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}m_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}}[\delta\eta^m_2]^*_{i\alpha J}[\delta\eta^m_1]^*_{iI\alpha}f_2(x_{_{A^0_i}},x_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}})\\
&+\frac{em_{e_I}}{\sqrt{2}(4\pi)^2s_{_{\rm W}}\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\Big[(U_+)^*_{1\alpha}(V_{_L})^*_{KJ}[\delta^2\eta^m_2]^*_{(3+K)\alpha I}\\
&+(U_+)_{1\alpha}(V_{_L})_{KI}[\delta^2\eta^m_2]^*_{(3+K)\alpha J}\Big]f_1(x_{_{A^0_{3+K}}},x_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}})\\
&-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}m_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}}\Big[(U_-)^*_{2\alpha}(Y_{_E}V_{_R})^*_{KI}[\delta^2\eta^m_2]_{(3+K)\alpha J}\\
&+\frac{e}{s_{_{\rm W}}}(U_+)^*_{1\alpha}(V_{_L})^*_{KJ}[\delta^2\eta^m_1]^*_{(3+K)I\alpha}\Big]f_2(x_{_{A^0_{3+K}}},x_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}})\\
&+\frac{m_{e_I}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}[\delta\eta^m_2]^*_{(6+i)\alpha J}[\delta\eta^m_2]_{(6+i)\alpha I}f_1(x_{_{A^0_{6+i}}},x_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}})\\
&-\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}m_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}}[\delta\eta^m_2]^*_{(6+i)\alpha J}[\delta\eta^m_1]_{(6+i)I\alpha}f_2(x_{_{A^0_{6+i}}},x_{_{\chi^\pm_\alpha}})\\
&+\frac{\sqrt{2}m^2_{e_I}\cos\beta}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2\upsilon_d}\Big\{[\delta^2\eta^e]^*_{1IJ}f_1(x_{_Z},0)-[\delta^2\eta^e]_{1JI}f_2(x_{_Z},0)\Big\}\\
&-\frac{\sqrt{2}m^2_{e_I}\sin\beta}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2\upsilon_d}\Big\{[\delta^2\eta^e]^*_{3IJ}f_1(x_{_{A^0_3}},0)-[\delta^2\eta^e]_{3JI}f_2(x_{_{A^0_3}},0)\Big\}\,,
\end{aligned}
\tag{92}
$$

the concrete expressions for lepton number violating couplings are collected in appendix.(D).

- The interactions between charged Higgs and neutralinos/neutrinos, we write the relevant Wilson coefficients as

$$
\begin{aligned}
(A^3_{_L})_{IJ}=&\frac{m_{e_I}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{b=1}^{5}[\delta\zeta^{_L}_{\tilde{L}}]_{KJb}[\delta\zeta^{_L}_{\tilde{L}}]^*_{KIb}f_3(x_{_{H^\pm_{2+K}}},0)\\
&+\frac{m_{e_I}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{b=1}^{5}[\delta\zeta^{_L}_{\tilde{R}}]_{KJb}[\delta\zeta^{_L}_{\tilde{R}}]^*_{KIb}f_3(x_{_{H^\pm_{5+K}}},0)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4} m_{_{e_I}}[\delta\zeta_G^L]_{_{1J\chi_\alpha^0}}[\delta\zeta_G^L]^*_{_{1I\chi_\alpha^0}} f_3(x_{_{\rm W}}, x_{_{\chi_\alpha^0}})\\
&+\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4} m_{_{\chi_\alpha^0}}[\delta\zeta_G^L]_{_{1J\chi_\alpha^0}}[\delta\zeta_G^R]^*_{_{1I\chi_\alpha^0}} f_4(x_{_{\rm W}}, x_{_{\chi_\alpha^0}})\\
&+\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4} m_{_{e_I}}[\delta\zeta_H^L]_{_{2J\chi_\alpha^0}}[\delta\zeta_H^L]^*_{_{2I\chi_\alpha^0}} f_3(x_{_{H_2^\pm}}, x_{_{\chi_\alpha^0}})\\
&+\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4} m_{_{\chi_\alpha^0}}[\delta\zeta_H^L]_{_{2J\chi_\alpha^0}}[\delta\zeta_H^R]^*_{_{2I\chi_\alpha^0}} f_4(x_{_{H_2^\pm}}, x_{_{\chi_\alpha^0}})\\
&+\frac{m_{_{e_I}}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4}\Big\{\Big[\frac{e\sqrt{2}}{c_{\rm W}}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})_{21}\Big(V_{_R}\Big)_{KJ}(U_\chi)_{1\alpha}\\
&+(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{KJ}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})_{11}(U_\chi)_{3\alpha}\Big][\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde L}^L]^*_{_{KI\chi_\alpha^0}} + \Big[\frac{e\sqrt{2}}{c_{\rm W}}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})^*_{21}\Big(V_{_R}\Big)^*_{KI}(U_\chi)^*_{1\alpha}\\
&+(Y_{_E}V_{_R})^*_{KI}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})^*_{11}(U_\chi)^*_{3\alpha}\Big][\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde L}^L]_{_{KJ\chi_\alpha^0}}\Big\}f_3(x_{_{H^\pm_{2+K}}}, x_{_{\chi_\alpha^0}})\\
&+\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4} m_{_{\chi_\alpha^0}}\Big\{\Big[\frac{e\sqrt{2}}{c_{\rm W}}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})_{21}\Big(V_{_R}\Big)_{KJ}(U_\chi)_{1\alpha}\\
&+(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{KJ}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})_{11}(U_\chi)_{3\alpha}\Big][\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde L}^R]^*_{_{KI\chi_\alpha^0}}\\
&+\Big[-\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})^*_{11}\Big(V_{_L}\Big)_{KI}\Big(c_{\rm W}(U_\chi)_{2\alpha}+s_{\rm W}(U_\chi)_{1\alpha}\Big)\\
&+(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})^*_{21}(V_{_L}^\dagger Y_{_E})^*_{IK}(U_\chi)_{3\alpha}\Big][\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde L}^L]_{_{KJ\chi_\alpha^0}}\Big\}f_4(x_{_{H^\pm_{2+K}}}, x_{_{\chi_\alpha^0}})\\
&+\frac{m_{_{e_I}}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4}\Big\{\Big[\frac{e\sqrt{2}}{c_{\rm W}}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})_{22}\Big(V_{_R}\Big)_{KJ}(U_\chi)_{1\alpha}\\
&+(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{KJ}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})_{12}(U_\chi)_{3\alpha}\Big][\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde R}^L]^*_{_{KI\chi_\alpha^0}} + \Big[\frac{e\sqrt{2}}{c_{\rm W}}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})^*_{22}\Big(V_{_R}\Big)^*_{KI}(U_\chi)^*_{1\alpha}\\
&+(Y_{_E}V_{_R})^*_{KI}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})^*_{12}(U_\chi)^*_{3\alpha}\Big][\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde R}^L]_{_{KJ\chi_\alpha^0}}\Big\}f_3(x_{_{H^\pm_{5+K}}}, x_{_{\chi_\alpha^0}})\\
&+\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4} m_{_{\chi_\alpha^0}}\Big\{\Big[\frac{e\sqrt{2}}{c_{\rm W}}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})_{22}\Big(V_{_R}\Big)_{KJ}(U_\chi)_{1\alpha}\\
&+(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{KJ}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})_{12}(U_\chi)_{3\alpha}\Big][\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde R}^R]^*_{_{KI\chi_\alpha^0}}\\
&+\Big[-\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})^*_{12}\Big(V_{_L}\Big)_{KI}\Big(c_{\rm W}(U_\chi)_{2\alpha}+s_{\rm W}(U_\chi)_{1\alpha}\Big)\\
&+(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})^*_{22}(V_{_L}^\dagger Y_{_E})^*_{IK}(U_\chi)_{3\alpha}\Big][\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde R}^L]_{_{KJ\chi_\alpha^0}}\Big\}f_4(x_{_{H^\pm_{5+K}}}, x_{_{\chi_\alpha^0}})\,,\\
(A^3_{_R})_{_{IJ}} &= \frac{\cos\beta m_{_{e_I}}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{b=1}^{3}\Big\{[\delta^2\zeta_G^L]_{_{1Ib}}(Y_{_E}V_{_R})^*_{bJ} + [\delta^2\zeta_G^L]^*_{_{1Jb}}(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{bI}\Big\}f_3(x_{_{\rm W}}, 0)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{\sin\beta m_{e_I}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{b=1}^{5}\Big\{[\delta^2\zeta_H^L]_{2Ib}(Y_{_E}V_{_R})^*_{bJ}+[\delta^2\zeta_H^L]^*_{2Jb}(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{bI}\Big\}f_3(x_{_{H_2^\pm}},0)\\
&+\frac{m_{e_I}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{b=1}^{5}[\delta\zeta_{\tilde L}^R]_{KJb}[\delta\zeta_{\tilde L}^R]^*_{KIb}f_3(x_{_{H^\pm_{2+K}}},0)\\
&+\frac{m_{e_I}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{b=1}^{5}[\delta\zeta_{\tilde R}^R]_{KJb}[\delta\zeta_{\tilde R}^R]^*_{KIb}f_3(x_{_{H^\pm_{5+K}}},0)\\
&+\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4}m_{e_I}[\delta\zeta_G^R]_{1J\chi^0_\alpha}[\delta\zeta_G^R]^*_{1I\chi^0_\alpha}f_3(x_{\rm W},x_{_{\chi^0_\alpha}})\\
&+\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4}m_{_{\chi^0_\alpha}}[\delta\zeta_G^R]_{1J\chi^0_\alpha}[\delta\zeta_G^L]^*_{1I\chi^0_\alpha}f_4(x_{\rm W},x_{_{\chi^0_\alpha}})\\
&+\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4}m_{e_I}[\delta\zeta_H^R]_{2J\chi^0_\alpha}[\delta\zeta_H^R]^*_{2I\chi^0_\alpha}f_3(x_{_{H_2^\pm}},x_{_{\chi^0_\alpha}})\\
&+\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4}m_{_{\chi^0_\alpha}}[\delta\zeta_H^R]_{2J\chi^0_\alpha}[\delta\zeta_H^L]^*_{2I\chi^0_\alpha}f_4(x_{_{H_2^\pm}},x_{_{\chi^0_\alpha}})\\
&+\frac{m_{e_I}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4}\Big\{\Big[-\frac{e}{\sqrt2 s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})_{11}\Big(V_{_L}\Big)^*_{KJ}\Big(c_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{2\alpha}+s_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{1\alpha}\Big)\\
&+(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})_{21}(V_{_L}^\dagger Y_{_E})_{JK}(U_\chi)^*_{3\alpha}\Big][\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde L}^R]^*_{KI\chi^0_\alpha}\\
&+\Big[-\frac{e}{\sqrt2 s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})^*_{11}\Big(V_{_L}\Big)_{KI}\Big(c_{\rm W}(U_\chi)_{2\alpha}+s_{\rm W}(U_\chi)_{1\alpha}\Big)\\
&+(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})^*_{21}(V_{_L}^\dagger Y_{_E})^*_{IK}(U_\chi)_{3\alpha}\Big][\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde L}^R]_{KJ\chi^0_\alpha}\Big\}f_3(x_{_{H^\pm_{2+K}}},x_{_{\chi^0_\alpha}})\\
&+\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4}m_{_{\chi^0_\alpha}}\Big\{\Big[\frac{e\sqrt2}{c_{\rm W}}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})^*_{21}\Big(V_{_R}\Big)_{KI}(U_\chi)^*_{1\alpha}\\
&+(Y_{_E}V_{_R})^*_{KI}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})^*_{11}(U_\chi)^*_{3\alpha}\Big][\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde L}^R]_{KJ\chi^0_\alpha}\\
&+\Big[-\frac{e}{\sqrt2 s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})_{11}\Big(V_{_L}\Big)_{KJ}\Big(c_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{2\alpha}+s_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{1\alpha}\Big)\\
&+(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})_{21}(V_{_L}^\dagger Y_{_E})_{JK}(U_\chi)^*_{3\alpha}\Big][\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde L}^L]^*_{KI\chi^0_\alpha}\Big\}f_4(x_{_{H^\pm_{2+K}}},x_{_{\chi^0_\alpha}})\\
&+\frac{m_{e_I}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4}\Big\{\Big[-\frac{e}{\sqrt2 s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})_{12}\Big(V_{_L}\Big)^*_{KJ}\Big(c_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{2\alpha}+s_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{1\alpha}\Big)\\
&+(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})_{22}(V_{_L}^\dagger Y_{_E})_{JK}(U_\chi)^*_{3\alpha}\Big][\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde R}^R]^*_{KI\chi^0_\alpha}\\
&+\Big[-\frac{e}{\sqrt2 s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})^*_{12}\Big(V_{_L}\Big)_{KI}\Big(c_{\rm W}(U_\chi)_{2\alpha}+s_{\rm W}(U_\chi)_{1\alpha}\Big)\\
&+(Z_{_{\tilde E_K}})^*_{22}(V_{_L}^\dagger Y_{_E})^*_{IK}(U_\chi)_{3\alpha}\Big][\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde R}^R]_{KJ\chi^0_\alpha}\Big\}f_3(x_{_{H^\pm_{5+K}}},x_{_{\chi^0_\alpha}})
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4} m_{\chi^0_\alpha}\Big\{\Big[\frac{e\sqrt{2}}{c_{\rm W}}(Z_{\tilde{E}_K})^*_{22}\Big(V_{R}\Big)_{KI}(U_\chi)^*_{1\alpha}\\
&+(Y_{E}V_{R})^*_{KI}(Z_{\tilde{E}_K})^*_{12}(U_\chi)^*_{3\alpha}\Big][\delta^2\zeta^R_{\tilde{R}}]_{KJ\chi^0_\alpha}\\
&+\Big[-\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}(Z_{\tilde{E}_K})_{12}\Big(V_{L}\Big)_{KJ}\Big(c_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{2\alpha}+s_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{1\alpha}\Big)\\
&+(Z_{\tilde{E}_K})_{22}(V_L^\dagger Y_{E})_{JK}(U_\chi)^*_{3\alpha}\Big][\delta^2\zeta^L_{\tilde{R}}]^*_{KI\chi^0_\alpha}\Big\}f_4(x_{H^\pm_{5+K}},x_{\chi^0_\alpha})\,,
\end{aligned}
\tag{93}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_3(x,y)&=\Big[-\frac{1}{12}\frac{\partial^3\varrho_{3,1}}{\partial x^3}+\frac{1}{4}\frac{\partial^2\varrho_{2,1}}{\partial x^2}\Big](x,y)\,,\\
f_4(x,y)&=\Big[-\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2\varrho_{2,1}}{\partial x^2}+\frac{\partial\varrho_{1,1}}{\partial x}\Big](x,y)\,,
\end{aligned}
\tag{94}
$$

and the explicit expressions for lepton number violating couplings are collected in appendix.(D).

- Neutral (charged) gauge bosons and chargino/charged leptons (neutralinos/neutrinos), the Wilson coefficients are formulated as

$$
\begin{aligned}
(A^4_{L})_{IJ}=&\frac{e^2}{2(4\pi)^2c^2_{\rm W}\Lambda^2}m_{e_I}\Big\{2[\delta^2\mathcal{C}^R]_{JI}f_5(x_{\rm Z},0)+[\delta^2\mathcal{C}^L]_{JI}f_6(x_{\rm Z},0)\Big\}\\
&+\frac{e^2}{4(4\pi)^2s^2_{\rm W}c^2_{\rm W}\Lambda^2}m_{e_I}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}[\delta\mathcal{C}^R]_{J\chi^-_\alpha}[\delta\mathcal{C}^R]^*_{I\chi^-_\alpha}f_5(x_{\rm Z},x_{\chi^-_\alpha})\\
&+\frac{e^2}{4(4\pi)^2s^2_{\rm W}c^2_{\rm W}\Lambda^2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}m_{\chi^-_\alpha}[\delta\mathcal{C}^L]_{J\chi^-_\alpha}[\delta\mathcal{C}^R]^*_{I\chi^-_\alpha}f_6(x_{\rm Z},x_{\chi^-_\alpha})\\
&+\frac{g^2_{BL}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}m_{e_I}\Big\{2[\delta^2\mathcal{B}^R]_{JI}f_5(x_{Z_{BL}},0)+[\delta^2\mathcal{B}^L]_{JI}f_6(x_{Z_{BL}},0)\Big\}\\
&+\frac{g^2_{BL}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}m_{e_I}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}[\delta\mathcal{B}^R]_{J\chi^-_\alpha}[\delta\mathcal{B}^R]^*_{I\chi^-_\alpha}f_5(x_{Z_{BL}},x_{\chi^-_\alpha})\\
&+\frac{g^2_{BL}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}m_{\chi^-_\alpha}[\delta\mathcal{B}^L]_{J\chi^-_\alpha}[\delta\mathcal{B}^R]^*_{I\chi^-_\alpha}f_6(x_{Z_{BL}},x_{\chi^-_\alpha})\\
&+\frac{e^2}{(4\pi)^2s^2_{\rm W}\Lambda^2}m_{e_I}\sum_{\beta=1}^{4}[\delta\mathcal{V}^R]_{J\chi^0_\beta}[\delta\mathcal{V}^R]^*_{I\chi^0_\beta}f_7(x_{\rm W},x_{\chi^0_\beta})\\
&+\frac{e^2}{(4\pi)^2s^2_{\rm W}\Lambda^2}\sum_{\beta=1}^{4}m_{\chi^0_\beta}[\delta\mathcal{V}^R]_{J\chi^0_\beta}[\delta\mathcal{V}^L]^*_{I\chi^0_\beta}f_8(x_{\rm W},x_{\chi^0_\beta})\,,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
(A^4_{_R})_{_{IJ}} = & \frac{e^2(2s^2_{_{\rm W}}-1)}{4(4\pi)^2 s^2_{_{\rm W}} c^2_{_{\rm W}}\Lambda^2} m_{_{e_I}} \Big\{ 2[\delta^2\mathcal{C}^L]_{_{JI}} f_5(x_{_{\rm Z}},0) + [\delta^2\mathcal{C}^R]_{_{JI}} f_6(x_{_{\rm Z}},0) \Big\} \\
& + \frac{e^2}{4(4\pi)^2 s^2_{_{\rm W}} c^2_{_{\rm W}}\Lambda^2} m_{_{e_I}} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} [\delta\mathcal{C}^L]_{_{J\chi^-_\alpha}} [\delta\mathcal{C}^L]^*_{_{I\chi^-_\alpha}} f_5(x_{_{\rm Z}}, x_{_{\chi^-_\alpha}}) \\
& + \frac{e^2}{4(4\pi)^2 s^2_{_{\rm W}} c^2_{_{\rm W}}\Lambda^2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} m_{_{\chi^-_\alpha}} [\delta\mathcal{C}^R]_{_{J\chi^-_\alpha}} [\delta\mathcal{C}^L]^*_{_{I\chi^-_\alpha}} f_6(x_{_{\rm Z}}, x_{_{\chi^-_\alpha}}) \\
& + \frac{g^2_{_{BL}}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2} m_{_{e_I}} \Big\{ 2[\delta^2\mathcal{B}^L]_{_{JI}} f_5(x_{_{Z_{BL}}},0) + [\delta^2\mathcal{B}^R]_{_{JI}} f_6(x_{_{Z_{BL}}},0) \Big\} \\
& + \frac{g^2_{_{BL}}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2} m_{_{e_I}} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} [\delta\mathcal{B}^L]_{_{J\chi^-_\alpha}} [\delta\mathcal{B}^L]^*_{_{I\chi^-_\alpha}} f_5(x_{_{Z_{BL}}}, x_{_{\chi^-_\alpha}}) \\
& + \frac{g^2_{_{BL}}}{(4\pi)^2\Lambda^2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2} m_{_{\chi^-_\alpha}} [\delta\mathcal{B}^R]_{_{J\chi^-_\alpha}} [\delta\mathcal{B}^L]^*_{_{I\chi^-_\alpha}} f_6(x_{_{Z_{BL}}}, x_{_{\chi^-_\alpha}}) \\
& - \frac{e^2}{\sqrt{2}(4\pi)^2 s^2_{_{\rm W}}\Lambda^2} m_{_{e_I}} \sum_{I'=1}^{3} \Big\{ [\delta^2\mathcal{V}^L]^*_{_{II'}} (V_{_L})^*_{_{I'J}} + [\delta^2\mathcal{V}^L]_{_{JI'}} (V_{_L})_{_{I'I}} \Big\} f_7(x_{_{\rm W}},0) \\
& + \frac{e^2}{(4\pi)^2 s^2_{_{\rm W}}\Lambda^2} m_{_{e_I}} \sum_{\beta=1}^{4} [\delta\mathcal{V}^L]_{_{J\chi^0_\beta}} [\delta\mathcal{V}^L]^*_{_{I\chi^0_\beta}} f_7(x_{_{\rm W}}, x_{_{\chi^0_\beta}}) \\
& + \frac{e^2}{(4\pi)^2 s^2_{_{\rm W}}\Lambda^2} \sum_{\beta=1}^{4} m_{_{\chi^0_\beta}} [\delta\mathcal{V}^L]_{_{J\chi^0_\beta}} [\delta\mathcal{V}^R]^*_{_{I\chi^0_\beta}} f_8(x_{_{\rm W}}, x_{_{\chi^0_\beta}}) \; ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{95}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_5(x,y) &= \big[\frac{1}{6}\frac{\partial^3 \varrho_{_{3,1}}}{\partial x^3} - \frac{\partial \varrho_{_{1,1}}}{\partial x} \big](x,y) \; , \\
f_6(x,y) &= \big[-2\frac{\partial^2 \varrho_{_{2,1}}}{\partial x^2} + 4\frac{\partial \varrho_{_{1,1}}}{\partial x} \big](x,y) \; , \\
f_7(x,y) &= \big[-\frac{1}{6}\frac{\partial^3 \varrho_{_{3,1}}}{\partial x^3} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 \varrho_{_{2,1}}}{\partial x^2} \big](x,y) \; , \\
f_8(x,y) &= 2\frac{\partial^2 \varrho_{_{2,1}}}{\partial x^2}(x,y) \; .
\end{aligned}
\tag{96}
$$

Actually the coefficients in above equations are not depend on the concrete choice of matching energy scale Λ, and we choose $\Lambda = m_{_{\rm W}}$ in numerical analysis. When we ignore the mixing between left- and right-handed sleptons, the above results are consistent with that from mass insertion approach. At 90% confidence level the upper bound on the branching ratio of $\mu \to e\gamma$ is [39]

$$
B(\mu \to e\gamma) \leq B^{ub}_{_{\mu\to e\gamma}} = 5.7 \times 10^{-13} \; . \tag{97}
$$

To investigate the constraint on the parameter space from above experimental data, we define the ratios between the theoretical evaluation $B^{th}_{\mu\to e\gamma}$ on the branching ratio of $\mu \to e\gamma$ and corresponding experimental upper bound $B^{ub}_{\mu\to e\gamma}$ as

$$R_{\mu\to e\gamma} = \frac{B^{th}_{\mu\to e\gamma}}{B^{ub}_{\mu\to e\gamma}} \,, \tag{98}$$

and $R_{\mu\to e\gamma} < 1$ implies theoretical evaluation satisfying the experimental bound.

Similarly the lepton flavor violating process $\mu \to 3e$ is evoked by neutral gauge bosons Z, Z_{BL} at tree level, the corresponding decay width is [38]

$$\Gamma_{\mu\to 3e} = \frac{m_\mu^5}{1536\pi^3}\Big\{2|F_{LL}|^2 + 2|F_{RR}|^2 + |F_{LR}|^2 + |F_{RL}|^2\Big\} \,, \tag{99}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{LL} &= \frac{e^2(2s_{\rm W}^2-1)}{4s_{\rm W}^2 c_{\rm W}^2 m_{\rm Z}^2}[\delta^2\mathcal{C}^L]_{21} + \frac{g_{BL}^2}{m_{Z_{BL}}^2}[\delta^2\mathcal{B}^L]_{21} \,, \\
F_{RR} &= \frac{e^2}{2c_{\rm W}^2 m_{\rm Z}^2}[\delta^2\mathcal{C}^R]_{21} + \frac{g_{BL}^2}{m_{Z_{BL}}^2}[\delta^2\mathcal{B}^R]_{21} \,, \\
F_{LR} &= \frac{e^2}{2c_{\rm W}^2 m_{\rm Z}^2}[\delta^2\mathcal{C}^L]_{21} + \frac{g_{BL}^2}{m_{Z_{BL}}^2}[\delta^2\mathcal{B}^L]_{21} \,, \\
F_{RL} &= \frac{e^2(2s_{\rm W}^2-1)}{4s_{\rm W}^2 c_{\rm W}^2 m_{\rm Z}^2}[\delta^2\mathcal{C}^R]_{21} + \frac{g_{BL}^2}{m_{Z_{BL}}^2}[\delta^2\mathcal{B}^R]_{21} \,.
\end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

The current bound on the $\mu \to 3e$ decay has been set by the SINDRUM experiment at PSI [40]:

$$B(\mu \to 3e) \le B^{ub}_{\mu\to 3e} = 10^{-12} \,. \tag{101}$$

VI. $gg \to h^0$ AND $h^0 \to \gamma\gamma,\ ZZ^*,\ WW^*$

The Higgs is produced chiefly through the gluon fusion at the LHC. In the SM, the leading order (LO) contributions originate from the one-loop diagram which involves virtual top quarks. The cross section for this process is known to the next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO)[41] which can enhance the LO result by 80-100%. Furthermore, any new particle

which strongly couples with the Higgs can significantly modify this cross section. In extension of the SM considered here, the LO decay width for the process $h^0 \to gg$ is given by (see Ref.[42] and references therein)

$$\Gamma_{_{NP}}(h^0 \to gg) = \frac{G_{_F}\alpha_s^2 m_{_{h^0}}^3}{64\sqrt{2}\pi^3}\Big|\sum_q g_{_{h^0qq}} A_{1/2}(x_q) + \sum_{\tilde{q}} g_{_{h^0\tilde{q}\tilde{q}}}\frac{m_{_Z}^2}{m_{\tilde{q}}^2}A_0(x_{\tilde{q}})\Big|^2 , \tag{102}$$

with $x_a = m_{_{h^0}}^2/(4m_a^2)$. In the sum above, $q = t,\ b$ and $\tilde{q} = \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_i,\ \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i,\ (i = 1,\ \cdots,\ 6)$. The concrete expressions for $g_{_{h^0tt}},\ g_{_{h^0bb}},\ g_{_{h^0\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_i\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_i}},\ g_{_{h^0\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i}},\ (i = 1,\ 6)$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{_{h^0tt}} &= \frac{1}{\sin\beta}\Big(Z_{_{H_0}}\Big)_{11} , \\
g_{_{h^0bb}} &= -\frac{1}{\cos\beta}\Big(Z_{_{H_0}}\Big)_{21}\sqrt{1+\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\frac{\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}^2}{\upsilon_d^2}} , \\
g_{_{h^0\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_i\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_i}} &= -\frac{s_{_W}c_{_W}}{em_{_Z}}\xi_{1ii}^{\tilde{\mathcal{U}}} , \quad (i = 1,\ \cdots, 6) , \\
g_{_{h^0\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i}} &= -\frac{s_{_W}c_{_W}}{em_{_Z}}\xi_{1ii}^{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}} , \quad (i = 1,\ \cdots, 6) .
\end{aligned} \tag{103}$$

Here, we adopt the abbreviation $s_{_W} = \sin\theta_{_W}$ with $\theta_{_W}$ denoting the Weinberg angle. Furthermore, e is the electromagnetic coupling constant, and the concrete expressions of $\xi_{1ii}^{\tilde{\mathcal{U}}},\ \xi_{1ii}^{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}$ can be found in appendix E. The form factors $A_{1/2},\ A_0$ in Eq.(102) are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{1/2}(x) &= 2\Big[x + (x-1)g(x)\Big]/x^2 , \\
A_0(x) &= -(x - g(x))/x^2 ,
\end{aligned} \tag{104}$$

with

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} \arcsin^2\sqrt{x},\ x \le 1 \\ -\frac{1}{4}\Big[\ln\frac{1+\sqrt{1-1/x}}{1-\sqrt{1-1/x}} - i\pi\Big]^2,\ x > 1 \end{cases} \tag{105}$$

The Higgs to diphoton decay is also obtained from loop diagrams, the LO contributions are derived from the one-loop diagrams containing virtual charged gauge boson $W^\pm$ or virtual top quarks in the SM. In this model, the charged Higgs together with corresponding supersymmetric partner, and the supersymmetric partners of charged standard particles also contribute the corrections to the decay width of Higgs to diphoton at LO, the corresponding

correction is written as

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{_{NP}}(h^0\to\gamma\gamma)=\frac{G_{_F}\alpha^2 m_{_{h^0}}^3}{128\sqrt{2}\pi^3}\Big|\sum_f N_c Q_f^2 g_{_{h^0ff}}A_{1/2}(x_f)+g_{_{h^0WW}}A_1(x_{\rm W})\\+\sum_{i=2}^{8} g_{_{h^0H_i^+H_i^-}}\frac{m_{\rm Z}^2}{m_{_{H_i^\pm}}^2}A_0(x_{_{H_i^\pm}})+\sum_{i=1}^{2} g_{_{h^0\chi_i^+\chi_i^-}}\frac{m_{\rm W}}{m_{_{\chi_i}}}A_{1/2}(x_{_{\chi_i}})\\+\sum_{\tilde q} N_c Q_f^2 g_{_{h^0\tilde q\tilde q}}\frac{m_{\rm Z}^2}{m_{_{\tilde q}}^2}A_0(x_{_{\tilde q}})\Big|^2\,,\end{aligned}\tag{106}$$

where the concrete expression for the loop functions A_1 is

$$A_1(x)=-\Big[2x^2+3x+3(2x-1)g(x)\Big]/x^2\,.\tag{107}$$

In addition, the couplings $g_{_{h^0\tau\tau}}$, $g_{_{h^0WW}}$,and $g_{_{h^0H^+H^-}}$ are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}&g_{_{h^0\tau\tau}}\simeq-\frac{1}{\cos\beta}\Big(Z_{_{H_0}}\Big)_{21}\sqrt{1+\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\frac{v_{_{L_\alpha}}^2}{v_d^2}}\,,\\&g_{_{h^0WW}}=\sin\beta\Big(Z_{_{H_0}}\Big)_{11}+\frac{\cos\beta}{\sqrt{v_d^2+\sum\limits_{\alpha=1}^{3}v_{_{L_\alpha}}^2}}\Big\{v_d\Big(Z_{_{H_0}}\Big)_{21}+\sum_{I=1}^{3}v_{_{L_I}}\Big(Z_{_{H_0}}\Big)_{(2+I)1}\Big\}\,,\\&g_{_{h^0H_i^-H_i^+}}=-\frac{s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}{em_{\rm Z}}\xi_{1ii}^{H^\pm}\;,\;\;(i=2,\,\cdots,8)\,,\end{aligned}\tag{108}$$

and the couplings between the lightest neutral CP-even Higgs and charginos $g_{_{h^0\chi_i^+\chi_i^-}}$ are

$$g_{_{h^0\chi_i^+\chi_i^-}}=-\frac{2}{e}\Re\Big[\xi_{1ii}^{\chi^\pm}\Big]\;,\;\;(i=1,\,2)\,.\tag{109}$$

The lightest neutral CP-even Higgs with 125 GeV mass can also decay through the modes $h^0\to ZZ^*$, $h^0\to WW^*$, where Z^*/W^* denote the off-shell neutral/charged electroweak gauge bosons. Summing over all channels available to W^* or Z^*, one writes the widths as[43]

$$\begin{aligned}&\Gamma(h^0\to WW^*)=\frac{3e^4 m_{_{h^0}}}{512\pi^3 s_{\rm W}^4}|g_{_{h^0WW}}|^2F(\frac{m_{\rm W}}{m_{_{h^0}}}),\\&\Gamma(h^0\to ZZ^*)=\frac{e^4 m_{_{h^0}}}{2048\pi^3 s_{\rm W}^4 c_{\rm W}^4}|g_{_{h^0ZZ}}|^2\Big(7-\frac{40}{3}s_{\rm W}^2+\frac{160}{9}s_{\rm W}^4\Big)F(\frac{m_{\rm Z}}{m_{_{h^0}}}),\end{aligned}\tag{110}$$

with $g_{_{h^0ZZ}} = g_{_{h^0WW}}$ and the abbreviation $c_{\rm w} = \cos\theta_{\rm w}$. The form factor $F(x)$ is given as

$$F(x) = -(1-x^2)\Big(\frac{47}{2}x^2 - \frac{13}{2} + \frac{1}{x^2}\Big) - 3(1-6x^2+4x^4)\ln x \\ + \frac{3(1-8x^2+20x^4)}{\sqrt{4x^2-1}}\cos^{-1}\Big(\frac{3x^2-1}{2x^3}\Big)\,. \tag{111}$$

Besides the Higgs discovery the ATLAS and CMS experiments have both observed an excess in Higgs production and decay into diphoton channel which slightly differs from the SM expectations. The observed signals for the Higgs decaying channels are quantified by the ratio

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\gamma\gamma} &= \frac{\sigma_{_{NP}}(h_0 \to gg)\,{\rm BR}_{_{NP}}(h_0 \to \gamma\gamma)}{\sigma_{_{SM}}(h_0 \to gg)\,{\rm BR}_{_{SM}}(h_0 \to \gamma\gamma)} \\ &\simeq \frac{\Gamma_{_{NP}}(h_0 \to gg)\,{\rm BR}_{_{NP}}(h_0 \to \gamma\gamma)}{\Gamma_{_{SM}}(h_0 \to gg)\,{\rm BR}_{_{SM}}(h_0 \to \gamma\gamma)}\,, \\ R_{VV^*} &= \frac{\sigma_{_{NP}}(h_0 \to gg)\,{\rm BR}_{_{NP}}(h_0 \to VV^*)}{\sigma_{_{SM}}(h_0 \to gg)\,{\rm BR}_{_{SM}}(h_0 \to VV^*)} \\ &\simeq \frac{\Gamma_{_{NP}}(h_0 \to gg)\,{\rm BR}_{_{NP}}(h_0 \to VV^*)}{\Gamma_{_{SM}}(h_0 \to gg)\,{\rm BR}_{_{SM}}(h_0 \to VV^*)}\,,\quad (V = Z,\ W)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{112}$$

To obtain the Higgs production cross sections normalised to the SM values, we adopt

$$\frac{\sigma_{_{NP}}(h_0 \to gg)}{\sigma_{_{SM}}(h_0 \to gg)} \simeq \frac{\Gamma^{h_0}_{_{NP}}\,{\rm BR}_{_{NP}}(h_0 \to gg)}{\Gamma^{h_0}_{_{SM}}\,{\rm BR}_{_{SM}}(h_0 \to gg)} \tag{113}$$

where $\Gamma^{h_0}_{_{SM}}$ denotes the total decay width of Higgs in the SM, and $\Gamma^{h_0}_{_{NP}}$ denotes the total decay width of the lightest Higgs h_0 in the supersymmetry with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry, respectively. To accommodate the observed Higgs signals at CMS and ATLAS, we require the theoretical predictions on $R_{\gamma\gamma},\ R_{VV^*}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} &0.9 < R_{\gamma\gamma} < 2.2\,, \\ &0.2 < R_{VV^*} < 1.4\,, (V = Z,\ W)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{114}$$

The lower bounds of the ranges originate from the lower limits of 95% C.L. range for observed Higgs strength[3, 4], and the upper bounds of the ranges originate from 95% C.L. exclusion from Higgs searching[5, 6].

In the SM the main contribution to $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ originates from charged gauge bosons and is partially compensated by the top quark contribution. Within framework of the MSSM, the branching ratio is enhanced by light scalar quarks originating from large mixing between left- and right-hand scalar partners. However this effect is generally overcompensated by a suppression of the gluon fusion production rate, and the evaluations on a Higgs gluon fusion production times photon decay rate is slightly lower than the corresponding one of the SM in the parameter region consistent with a 125 GeV Higgs [44]. In most cases the corrections to $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ from charginos also tend to reduce corresponding evaluation of the SM. The possible correction to enhance theoretical evaluations originates from scalar tau leptons, in which large mixing between left- and right-handed scalar tau leptons is evoked by large values of μ parameter and $\tan\beta$ [45]. Because mixing between the lightest Higgs and real components of left- and right-handed sneutrinos is below 0.02 in the parameter space consisting with present experimental data, the main source of corrections to $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ in the considered model here is similar to that in the MSSM.

VII. NUMERICAL ANALYSES

As mentioned above, the most stringent constraint on the parameter space is that the 8×8 mass squared matrix in Eq.(37) should produce the lightest eigenstate with a mass $m_{h_0} \simeq 125.9$ GeV. Furthermore, the neutrino oscillation experimental data and cosmological observations from Planck collaboration also constrain relevant parameter space strongly. In numerical analysis, we choose the mass of the lightest CP-odd Higgs $m_{A_3^0}$ as an input. In addition, we include the radiative corrections to the neutrino mass matrix in Eq.(58), and adopt the ansatz on the parameter space

$$
\begin{aligned}
& m_{\tilde{U}_3} = 1 \text{ TeV}, \;\; m_{\tilde{D}_3} = 2 \text{ TeV} \, , \\
& \Lambda_{\tilde{N}_1^c} = \Lambda_{\tilde{N}_2^c} = 3 \text{ TeV} \, , \\
& m_1 = 200 \text{ GeV} \, , \;\; m_2 = 400 \text{ GeV} \, , \\
& \upsilon_{N_1} = \upsilon_{N_2} = \upsilon_{N_3} = 2 \text{ TeV} \, ,
\end{aligned}
$$




FIG. 1: Assuming neutrino mass spectrum with NO and taking $\mu = 2$ TeV, $m_{BL} = 1$ TeV, we plot the mass squared differences and mixing angles of neutrinos versus $\tan\beta$. Where (a) the solid line stands Δm^2_{31} versus $\tan\beta$, the dashed line stands Δm^2_{21} versus $\tan\beta$, the dotted line denotes $\sum m_\nu$ varying with $\tan\beta$, together with the gray band A represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\Delta m^2_A = \Delta m^2_{31}$ within 1 standard deviation, the gray band B represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\Delta m^2_\odot = \Delta m^2_{21}$ within 1 standard deviation; and (b) solid line stands $\sin^2\theta_{23}$ versus $\tan\beta$, the dashed line stands $\sin^2\theta_{12}$ versus $\tan\beta$, the dotted line stands $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ versus $\tan\beta$, the dashed-dotted line stands $R_{\mu\to e\gamma}\times10^9$ versus $\tan\beta$, as well as the gray band A represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\sin^2\theta_{23}$ within 1 standard deviation, the gray band B represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\sin^2\theta_{12}$ within 1 standard deviation, the gray band C represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ within 1 standard deviation, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} m_{A^0_3} &= A_b = 1 \text{ TeV} , \\ A_\tau &= 1.5 \text{ TeV} \\ m_{Z_{BL}} &= 2.4 \text{ TeV} \end{aligned} \tag{115}$$

to reduce the number of free parameters in the model considered here. For relevant parameters in the SM, we choose[19]

$$\alpha_s(m_{\rm Z}) = 0.118 , \quad \alpha(m_{\rm Z}) = 1/128 , \quad s^2_{\rm W}(m_{\rm Z}) = 0.23 ,$$




FIG. 2: Assuming neutrino mass spectrum with NO and taking $\tan\beta = 20$, $\mu = 2$ TeV, we plot the mass squared differences and mixing angles of neutrinos versus $U(1)_{(B-L)}$ gauging mass m_{BL}. Where (a) the solid line denotes Δm^2_{31} versus m_{BL}, the dashed line denotes Δm^2_{21} versus m_{BL}, and the dotted line denotes $\sum m_\nu$ versus m_{BL}, together with the gray band A represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\Delta m^2_A = \Delta m^2_{31}$ within 1 standard deviation, the gray band B represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\Delta m^2_\odot = \Delta m^2_{21}$ within 1 standard deviation; and (b) solid line denotes $\sin^2\theta_{23}$ versus m_{BL}, the dashed line denotes $\sin^2\theta_{12}$ versus m_{BL}, the dotted line denotes $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ versus m_{BL}, the dashed-dotted line denotes $R_{\mu\to e\gamma}\times10^9$ versus m_{BL}, as well as the gray band A represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\sin^2\theta_{23}$ within 1 standard deviation, the gray band B represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\sin^2\theta_{12}$ within 1 standard deviation, the gray band C represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ within 1 standard deviation, respectively.

$$m_t = 174.2\ \text{GeV}\ ,\quad m_b = 4.18\ \text{GeV}\ ,\quad m_{\text{W}} = 80.4\ \text{GeV}\ . \tag{116}$$

In order to fit the experimental data on neutrino oscillations with two solutions of the neutrino mass spectrum, we choose the VEVs of left-handed sneutrinos and the Yukawa couplings of right-handed neutrinos respectively as

- for the NO spectrum:

$$\upsilon_{L_1} = 3.11\times10^{-4}\text{GeV},\ \upsilon_{L_2} = 6.83\times10^{-4}\text{GeV},\ \upsilon_{L_3} = 3.43\times10^{-4}\text{GeV},$$




FIG. 3: Assuming neutrino mass spectrum with IO and taking $m_{BL} = 1$ TeV, $\mu = 2$ TeV, we plot the mass squared differences and mixing angles of neutrinos versus $\tan\beta$. Where (a) the solid line stands Δm^2_{31} versus $\tan\beta$, the dashed line stands Δm^2_{23} versus $\tan\beta$, and the dotted line denotes $\sum m_\nu$ varying with $\tan\beta$, together with the gray band A represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\Delta m^2_{A} = \Delta m^2_{13}$ within 1 standard deviation, the gray band B represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\Delta m^2_{\odot} = \Delta m^2_{21}$ within 1 standard deviation; and (b) solid line stands $\sin^2\theta_{23}$ versus $\tan\beta$, the dashed line stands $\sin^2\theta_{12}$ versus $\tan\beta$, the dotted line stands $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ versus $\tan\beta$, the dashed-dotted line stands $R_{\mu\to e\gamma}\times10^6$ versus $\tan\beta$, as well as the gray band A represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\sin^2\theta_{23}$ within 1 standard deviation, the gray band B represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\sin^2\theta_{12}$ within 1 standard deviation, the gray band C represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ within 1 standard deviation, respectively.

$$(Y_1,\ Y_2,\ Y_3) = (0,\ 2.24\times10^{-7},\ 4.30\times10^{-7})\ , \tag{117}$$

and issue the theoretical predictions on neutrino masses and mixing angles as

$$\begin{aligned}
&m_{\nu_1}\simeq 0,\ \ m_{\nu_2}\simeq 8.71\times10^{-3}\ \text{eV},\ \ m_{\nu_3}\simeq 4.85\times10^{-2}\ \text{eV},\\
&\sum_i m_{\nu_i}\simeq 5.72\times10^{-2}\ \text{eV},\\
&\Delta m^2_{\odot} = m^2_{\nu_2} - m^2_{\nu_1}\simeq 7.58\times10^{-23}\ \text{GeV}^2,\\
&\Delta m^2_{A} = m^2_{\nu_3} - m^2_{\nu_1}\simeq 2.35\times10^{-21}\ \text{GeV}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\sin^2\theta_{12} \simeq 0.306,\ \ \sin^2\theta_{23} \simeq 0.420,\ \ \sin^2\theta_{13} \simeq 0.023 \tag{118}$$

when $\tan\beta = 20$, $m_{BL} = 1$ TeV, and $\mu = 2$ TeV;

- for the IO spectrum:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\upsilon_{L_1} = 1.89 \times 10^{-3}\text{GeV},\ \upsilon_{L_2} = 7.88 \times 10^{-4}\text{GeV},\ \upsilon_{L_3} = 1.05 \times 10^{-3}\text{GeV},\\
&(Y_1,\ Y_2,\ Y_3) = (1.61 \times 10^{-7},\ 3.82 \times 10^{-8},\ 0),
\end{aligned} \tag{119}$$

and issue the theoretical predictions on neutrino masses and mixing angles as

$$\begin{aligned}
&m_{\nu_1} \simeq 8.71 \times 10^{-3}\text{ eV},\ \ m_{\nu_2} \simeq 4.85 \times 10^{-2}\text{ eV},\ \ m_{\nu_3} \simeq 0,\\
&\sum_i m_{\nu_i} \simeq 5.72 \times 10^{-2}\text{ eV},\\
&\Delta m^2_{\odot} = m^2_{\nu_1} - m^2_{\nu_3} \simeq 7.58 \times 10^{-23}\text{ GeV}^2,\\
&\Delta m^2_{A} = m^2_{\nu_2} - m^2_{\nu_3} \simeq 2.35 \times 10^{-21}\text{ GeV}^2,\\
&\sin^2\theta_{12} \simeq 0.306,\ \ \sin^2\theta_{23} \simeq 0.420,\ \ \sin^2\theta_{13} \simeq 0.023
\end{aligned} \tag{120}$$

when $\tan\beta = 20$, $m_{BL} = 1$ TeV, and $\mu = 2$ TeV.

Meanwhile, the theoretical predictions on the branching ratio of $\mu \to 3e$ are all about 10^{-20}, far below the current experimental bound in Eq.(101) in both scenarios.

Additionally we can safely neglect the last two terms in Eq.(85) which are originate from the mixing between charginos and charged leptons, when we adopt the choices in Eq.(117) and Eq.(119). Further assuming the 3×3 Yukawa couplings Y_E diagonally we obtain the solution as $Y_E \simeq \text{diag}\,(\sqrt{2}m_e/\upsilon_d,\ \sqrt{2}m_\mu/\upsilon_d,\ \sqrt{2}m_\tau/\upsilon_d)$.

Assuming neutrino mass spectrum with NO and taking $m_{BL} = 1$ TeV, $\mu = 2$ TeV we depict the mass squared differences of neutrinos versus $\tan\beta$ in Fig.1(a). Where the solid line denotes $\Delta m^2_{31} = \Delta m^2_A$ varying with $\tan\beta$, the dashed line denotes $\Delta m^2_{21} = \Delta m^2_{\odot}$ varying with $\tan\beta$, and the dotted line denotes $\sum m_\nu$ varying with $\tan\beta$, respectively. With increasing of $\tan\beta$, the theoretical evaluations on Δm^2_{21}, Δm^2_{31} decrease steeply as $\tan\beta \leq 10$, and diminish mildly as $\tan\beta > 15$. Additional the theoretical evaluation on sum of active neutrino masses satisfies the cosmological observations of Planck. Using the same choice on parameter space, we also draw the mixing angles of neutrinos versus $\tan\beta$ in




FIG. 4: Assuming neutrino mass spectrum with IO and taking $\tan\beta = 20$, $\mu = 2$ TeV, we plot the mass squared differences and mixing angles of neutrinos versus $U(1)_{(B-L)}$ gauging mass m_{BL}. Where (a) the solid line denotes Δm^2_{23} versus m_{BL}, the dashed line denotes Δm^2_{13} versus m_{BL}, and the dotted line denotes $\sum m_\nu$ versus m_{BL}, together with the gray band A represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\Delta m^2_A = \Delta m^2_{31}$ within 1 standard deviation, the gray band B represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\Delta m^2_\odot = \Delta m^2_{21}$ within 1 standard deviation; and (b) solid line denotes $\sin^2\theta_{23}$ versus m_{BL}, the dashed line denotes $\sin^2\theta_{12}$ versus m_{BL}, the dotted line denotes $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ versus m_{BL}, the dashed-dotted line denotes $R_{\mu\to e\gamma}\times10^7$ versus m_{BL}, as well as the gray band A represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\sin^2\theta_{23}$ within 1 standard deviation, the gray band B represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\sin^2\theta_{12}$ within 1 standard deviation, the gray band C represents the points which deviate the experimental central value on $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ within 1 standard deviation, respectively.

Fig.1(b). Where the solid line denotes $\sin^2\theta_{23}$ versus $\tan\beta$, the dashed line denotes $\sin^2\theta_{12}$ versus $\tan\beta$, the dotted line denotes $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ versus $\tan\beta$, and the dashed-dotted line denotes $R_{\mu\to e\gamma}\times10^9$ versus $\tan\beta$, respectively. Actually, those mixing angles θ_{12}, θ_{23}, θ_{13} vary with $\tan\beta$ gently, and $R_{\mu\to e\gamma}$ depends on $\tan\beta$ strongly.

As a 'brand new' parameter, the $U(1)_{B-L}$ gaugino mass m_{BL} also affects the finally numerical results on neutrino sector in the MSSM with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry. Supposing neutrino mass spectrum with NO and taking $\tan\beta = 20$, $\mu = 2$ TeV, we plot the mass squared

differences of neutrinos versus $m_{_{BL}}$ in Fig.2(a). Where the solid line represents $\Delta m^2_{_{31}} = \Delta m^2_{_A}$ varying with $m_{_{BL}}$, the dashed line represents $\Delta m^2_{_{21}} = \Delta m^2_{_\odot}$ varying with $m_{_{BL}}$, the dotted line denotes $\sum m_\nu$ varying with $m_{_{BL}}$, respectively. With increasing of $m_{_{BL}}$, the theoretical prediction on $\Delta m^2_{_{31}}$ diminishes steeply, and that on $\Delta m^2_{_{21}}$ raises quickly, meanwhile the evaluation on sum of active neutrino masses is consistent with the cosmological upper bound from Planck collaboration. Because the effective 3×3 mass matrix for light active neutrinos depends on $m_{_{BL}}$ through the term $\zeta_i\zeta_j/\Lambda_\zeta \simeq (4\Delta^2_{_{BL}} m_{_{BL}}/m^4_{_{Z_{BL}}} - \tilde{m}\upsilon^2_{_d}/(4\tilde{\mu}^4))Y_iY_j\upsilon^2_{_N}$, the numerical evaluations on $\Delta m^2_{_{31}}$, $\Delta m^2_{_{21}}$ and $\sum m_\nu$ vary with $m_{_{BL}}$ actually. Using the same assumption on parameter space, we also present the mixing angles of neutrinos versus $m_{_{BL}}$ in Fig.2(b). Where the solid line denotes $\sin^2\theta_{_{23}}$ versus $m_{_{BL}}$, the dashed line denotes $\sin^2\theta_{_{12}}$ versus $m_{_{BL}}$, the dotted line denotes $\sin^2\theta_{_{13}}$ versus $m_{_{BL}}$, and the dashed-dotted line denotes $R_{\mu\to e\gamma}\times10^9$ versus $m_{_{BL}}$, respectively. Actually, the mixing angle $\theta_{_{12}}$ depends on $m_{_{BL}}$ mildly, and other mixing angles $\theta_{_{23}}$, $\theta_{_{13}}$ vary with $m_{_{BL}}$ acutely, and $R_{\mu\to e\gamma}$ varies with $m_{_{BL}}$ slowly..




FIG. 5: Assuming neutrino mass spectrum with IO and taking $m_{\tilde{Q}_3} = 14$ TeV, $m_{\tilde{L}_3} = 2$ TeV, $m_{\tilde{E}_3} = 1.72$ TeV, $m_{_{BL}} = 1$ TeV, $\mu = 2$ TeV, $A_t = 1.8$ TeV, we plot $m_{_{h^0}}$, $\Delta m_{_{h^0}}$, $\left|\left(Z_{_{H_0}}\right)_{12}\right|$, $Z_{_{h^0\tilde{N}^c}}$, $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ and R_{VV^*} $(V = Z,\ W)$ versus $\tan\beta$. Where (a) the solid line (I) denotes $\Delta m_{_{h^0}}/\text{GeV}$ versus $\tan\beta$, the dash-dot line (II) denotes $Z_{_{h^0\tilde{N}^c}}\times10^2$ versus $\tan\beta$, the dash line (III) denotes $m_{_{h^0}}/125.9\text{GeV}$ versus $\tan\beta$, as well as the dot line (IV) denotes $\left|\left(Z_{_{H_0}}\right)_{12}\right|\times10$ versus $\tan\beta$; and (b)the solid line denotes $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ versus $\tan\beta$, the dashed line denotes R_{VV^*} versus $\tan\beta$, respectively.

When the neutrino mass spectrum is IO, the manners of parameters $\tan\beta$, $m_{_{BL}}$ affecting

the numerical results on neutrino sector differ from that of the neutrino mass spectrum with NO. Assuming neutrino mass spectrum with IO and taking $m_{_{BL}} = 1$ TeV, $\mu = 2$ TeV, we plot the mass squared differences of neutrinos versus $\tan\beta$ in Fig.3(a). Where the solid line denotes $\Delta m^2_{_{23}} = \Delta m^2_{_A}$ varying with $\tan\beta$, the dashed line denotes $\Delta m^2_{_{13}} = \Delta m^2_{_\odot}$ varying with $\tan\beta$, and the dotted line denotes $\sum m_\nu$ varying with $\tan\beta$, respectively. Obviously the theoretical predictions on $\Delta m^2_{_{23}}$, $\Delta m^2_{_{13}}$ vary with $\tan\beta$ steeply as $\tan\beta < 20$, and the theoretical predictions on $\Delta m^2_{_{23}}$, $\Delta m^2_{_{13}}$ depend on $\tan\beta$ relatively mildly when $\tan\beta > 25$. Furthermore, the numerical evaluation on sum of active neutrino masses fulfills the upper limit from Planck observations. Adopting the same choice on parameter space, we also show the mixing angles of neutrinos versus $\tan\beta$ in Fig.3(b). Where the solid line denotes $\sin^2\theta_{_{23}}$ versus $\tan\beta$, the dashed line denotes $\sin^2\theta_{_{12}}$ versus $\tan\beta$, the dotted line denotes $\sin^2\theta_{_{13}}$ versus $\tan\beta$, and the dashed-dotted line denotes $R_{\mu\to e\gamma}\times 10^7$ versus $\tan\beta$, respectively. Obviously the mixing angle $\theta_{_{12}}$ increases quickly with increasing of $\tan\beta$, and the mixing angles $\theta_{_{23}}$, $\theta_{_{13}}$ vary with $\tan\beta$ slowly, and $R_{\mu\to e\gamma}$ depends on $\tan\beta$ strongly.

As mentioned above, the $U(1)_{_{(B-L)}}$ gaugino mass $m_{_{BL}}$ also affects the numerical evaluations in neutrino sector when neutrino mass spectrum is IO. Assuming neutrino mass spectrum with IO and taking $\tan\beta = 20$, $\mu = 2$ TeV, we depict the mass squared differences of neutrinos versus the $U(1)_{_{(B-L)}}$ gaugino mass $m_{_{BL}}$ in Fig.4(a). Where the solid line represents $\Delta m^2_{_{23}} = \Delta m^2_{_A}$ varying with $m_{_{BL}}$, the dashed line represents $\Delta m^2_{_{13}} = \Delta m^2_{_\odot}$ varying with $m_{_{BL}}$, respectively. With increasing of $m_{_{BL}}$, the theoretical prediction on $\Delta m^2_{_{23}}$ raises steeply, and that on $\Delta m^2_{_{13}}$ decreases quickly. For the aforementioned reason in NO neutrino spectrum, those evaluations on $\Delta m^2_{_{23}}$, $\Delta m^2_{_{13}}$ and $\sum m_\nu$ depend on $m_{_{BL}}$ impressibly. Adopting the same assumption on parameter space, we also draw the mixing angles of neutrinos versus $m_{_{BL}}$ in Fig.4(b). Where the solid line stands $\sin^2\theta_{_{23}}$ versus $m_{_{BL}}$, the dashed line stands $\sin^2\theta_{_{12}}$ versus $m_{_{BL}}$, the dotted line stands $\sin^2\theta_{_{13}}$ versus $m_{_{BL}}$, and the dashed-dotted line denotes $R_{\mu\to e\gamma}\times 10^7$ versus $m_{_{BL}}$, respectively. Obviously the mixing angle $\theta_{_{12}}$ decreases quickly with increasing of $m_{_{BL}}$, and the mixing angles $\theta_{_{23}}$, $\theta_{_{13}}$ and $R_{\mu\to e\gamma}$ vary with $m_{_{BL}}$ mildly.

Choosing the assumptions presented in Eq.(117) and Eq.(119), one finds that the radiative corrections from right-handed neutrino sector to the CP-even Higgs mass squared matrix




FIG. 6: Assuming neutrino mass spectrum with IO and taking $\tan\beta = 20$, $m_{\tilde{Q}_3} = 14$ TeV, $m_{\tilde{L}_3} = 2$ TeV, $m_{\tilde{E}_3} = 1.72$ TeV, $m_{BL} = 1$ TeV, $\mu = 2$ TeV, we plot m_{h^0}, Δm_{h^0}, $\left|\left(Z_{H_0}\right)_{12}\right|$, $Z_{h^0\tilde{N}^c}$, $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ and R_{VV^*} ($V = Z,\ W$) versus A_t. Where (a) the solid line (I) denotes Δm_{h^0}/GeV versus A_t, the dash-dot line (II) denotes $Z_{h^0\tilde{N}^c} \times 10^2$ versus A_t, the dash line (III) denotes m_{h^0}/125.9GeV versus A_t, as well as the dot line (IV) denotes $\left|\left(Z_{H_0}\right)_{12}\right| \times 10$ versus A_t; and (b)the solid line denotes $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ versus A_t, the dashed line denotes R_{VV^*} versus A_t, respectively.

can be neglected safely[25]. This fact implies that theoretical predictions on Higgs sector almost do not depend on our hypothesis of neutrino mass spectrum. Assuming neutrino mass spectrum with IO and taking $\tan\beta = 20$, $m_{\tilde{Q}_3} = 14$ TeV, $m_{\tilde{L}_3} = 2$ TeV, $m_{\tilde{E}_3} = 1.72$ TeV, $m_{BL} = 1$ TeV, $\mu = 2$ TeV, $A_t = 1.8$ TeV, we obtain the following numerical results in Higgs sector as

$$\begin{aligned}
&m_{h^0} \simeq 125.9 \text{ GeV}, \ \ \Delta m_{h^0} = m_{h^0} - m_{h^0}^{MSSM} \simeq 2.77 \text{ GeV}, \\
&m_{H_2^0} \simeq 1.40 \text{ TeV}, \ \ \left|\left(Z_{H_0}\right)_{12}\right| \simeq 0.051, \\
&Z_{h^0\tilde{N}^c} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{3} \left|\left(Z_{H_0}\right)_{1(3+i)}\right|^2} \simeq 1.53 \times 10^{-2}, \\
&R_{\gamma\gamma} = 0.99, \ R_{VV^*} = 0.88 \ . \qquad (121)
\end{aligned}$$

Here $m_{h^0}^{MSSM}$ is theoretical evaluation on the lightest CP-even mass including one-loop corrections and leading terms from two-loop contributions, and m_{h^0} is corresponding evaluation in the MSSM with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry. Furthermore $m_{H_2^0}$ represents the heavier CP-even Higgs in the MSSM, $\left(Z_{H_0}\right)_{12}$ represents the mixing between H_2^0 and h^0, $Z_{h^0\tilde{N}^c}$ represents

the mixing between the lightest CP-even Higgs and real parts of right-handed sneutrinos, respectively.




FIG. 7: Assuming neutrino mass spectrum with IO and taking $\tan\beta = 20$, $m_{\tilde{L}_3} = 2$ TeV, $m_{\tilde{E}_3} = 1.72$ TeV, $m_{BL} = 1$ TeV, $\mu = 2$ TeV, $A_t = 1.8$ TeV, we plot m_{h^0}, Δm_{h^0}, $\left|\left(Z_{H_0}\right)_{12}\right|$, $Z_{h^0\tilde{N}^c}$, $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ and R_{VV^*} ($V = Z,\ W$) versus $m_{\tilde{Q}_3}$. Where (a) the solid line (I) denotes Δm_{h^0}/GeV versus $m_{\tilde{Q}_3}$, the dash-dot line (II) denotes $Z_{h^0\tilde{N}^c} \times 10^2$ versus $m_{\tilde{Q}_3}$, the dash line (III) denotes m_{h^0}/125.9GeV versus $m_{\tilde{Q}_3}$, as well as the dot line (IV) denotes $\left|\left(Z_{H_0}\right)_{12}\right| \times 10$ versus $m_{\tilde{Q}_3}$; and (b)the solid line denotes $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ versus $m_{\tilde{Q}_3}$, the dashed line denotes R_{VV^*} versus $m_{\tilde{Q}_3}$, respectively.

Assuming neutrino mass spectrum with IO and taking $m_{\tilde{Q}_3} = 14$ TeV, $m_{\tilde{L}_3} = 1.72$ TeV, $m_{\tilde{E}_3} = 2$ TeV, $m_{BL} = 1$ TeV, $\mu = 2$ TeV, $A_t = 1.8$ TeV, we plot m_{h^0}, Δm_{h^0}, $\left|\left(Z_{H_0}\right)_{12}\right|$, and $Z_{h^0\tilde{N}^c}$ versus $\tan\beta$ in Fig.5(a). Where the solid line (I) denotes Δm_{h^0}/GeV versus $\tan\beta$, the dash-dot line (II) denotes $Z_{h^0\tilde{N}^c} \times 10^2$ versus $\tan\beta$, the dash line (III) denotes m_{h^0}/125.9GeV versus $\tan\beta$, as well as the dot line (IV) denotes $\left|\left(Z_{H_0}\right)_{12}\right| \times 10$ versus $\tan\beta$, respectively. The evaluation on the lightest CP-even Higgs mass m_{h^0} coincides with the ATLAS/CMS data in one standard deviation: 123.8 GeV $\leq m_{h^0} \leq$ 128.0 GeV as $3 \leq \tan\beta \leq 60$. Since the main corrections to Δm_{h^0} originate from scalar top sector, the evaluation on Δm_{h^0} decreases with increasing of $\tan\beta$ as $\tan\beta \lesssim 10$. Correspondingly, the evaluation on Δm_{h^0} increases with increasing of $\tan\beta$ as $\tan\beta \gtrsim 30$ because the corrections to Δm_{h^0} from scalar bottom and tau sectors are magnified. The mixing $Z_{h^0\tilde{N}^c}$ between the lightest CP-even Higgs and right-handed sneutinos is dominated by the loop corrections, and is well above 10^{-2} with

our assumptions on parameter space. The mixing between h^0 and H_2^0 decreases steeply with increasing of $\tan\beta$. Similarly, we also depict $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ and R_{VV^*} versus $\tan\beta$ in Fig.5(b). With increasing of $\tan\beta$, $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ decreases slowly as $\tan\beta < 5$ since the main corrections to $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ originate from scalar top sector, and raises mildly as $\tan\beta > 30$ since the corresponding corrections mainly originate from the scalar tau sector. Meanwhile R_{VV^*} ($V = Z,\ W$) decreases smoothly with increasing of $\tan\beta$. Although the loop induced mixing between h^0 and right-handed sneutrinos exceeds 0.01, this mixing cannot modify theoretical evaluation on $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ drastically. Actually the decay width of $h^0 \to \gamma\gamma$ is enhanced by light scalar quarks originating from large mixing between left- and right-hand scalar partners in the model considered here. However this effect is generally offset by a suppression of the production rate for $gg \to h^0$, and the evaluations on a Higgs gluon fusion production times photon decay rate is approximately equal to or slightly lower than the corresponding one of the SM in the parameter region consistent with a 125 GeV Higgs. In most parameter space the corrections to the decay width of $h^0 \to \gamma\gamma$ from charginos also tend to reduce corresponding evaluation of the SM, which is consistent with the numerical results in the MSSM[44, 45] qualitatively. With our assumptions on the parameter space the corrections to $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ from charged scalar leptons cannot modify the corresponding SM evaluation drastically since scalar taus all have TeV masses.

Assuming neutrino mass spectrum with IO and taking $\tan\beta = 20$, $m_{\tilde{Q}_3} = 14$ TeV, $m_{\tilde{L}_3} = 1.72$ TeV, $m_{\tilde{E}_3} = 2$ TeV, $m_{BL} = 1$ TeV, $\mu = 2$ TeV, we plot m_{h^0}, Δm_{h^0}, $\left|\left(Z_{H_0}\right)_{12}\right|$, and $Z_{h^0\tilde{N}^c}$ versus A_t in Fig.6(a). The evaluation on the lightest CP-even Higgs mass m_{h^0} coincides with the ATLAS/CMS data in one standard deviation as $|A_t| \lesssim 4$ TeV. With increasing of $|A_t|$, the evaluation on m_{h^0} raises mildly. Meanwhile the correction to m_{h^0} from the mixing between the lightest CP-even Higgs and right-handed sneutrinos exceeds 2 GeV around $|A_t| \lesssim 4$ TeV, and decreases with increasing of $|A_t|$. The mixing between the lightest CP-even Higgs and right-handed sneutrinos $Z_{h^0\tilde{N}^c}$ is dominated by the radiative corrections, is well above 10^{-2} as $|A_t| \lesssim 6$ TeV. The mixing between h^0 and H_2^0 changes mildly with A_t. Similarly, we also depict $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ and R_{VV^*} versus A_t in Fig.6(b). $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ and R_{VV^*} ($V = Z,\ W$) vary gently as $|A_t| \lesssim 4$ TeV. Similarly the theoretical evaluations on $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ and R_{VV^*} ($V = Z,\ W$) are all smaller than 1 since the reason mentioned above.

Assuming neutrino mass spectrum with IO and taking $\tan\beta = 20$, $m_{\tilde{L}_3} = 1.72$ TeV, $m_{\tilde{E}_3} = 2$ TeV, $m_{BL} = 1$ TeV, $\mu = 2$ TeV, $A_t = 1.8$ TeV, we plot m_{h^0}, Δm_{h^0}, $\left|\left(Z_{H_0}\right)_{12}\right|$, and $Z_{h^0\tilde{N}^c}$ versus $m_{\tilde{Q}_3}$ in Fig.7(a). The evaluation on the lightest CP-even Higgs mass m_{h^0} coincides with the ATLAS/CMS data in one standard deviation as $m_{\tilde{Q}_3} \gtrsim 2$ TeV. Because the one-loop corrections to the mixing between the lightest CP-even Higgs and right-handed sneutinos are proportional to $m^2_{\tilde{Q}_3} - m^2_{\tilde{U}_3}$, the correction to m_{h^0} from the mixing between the lightest CP-even Higgs and right-handed sneutrinos exceeds 1 GeV when $m_{\tilde{Q}_3} \gtrsim 4$ TeV, and raises with increasing of $m_{\tilde{Q}_3}$. The mixing between the lightest CP-even Higgs and right-handed sneutinos $Z_{h^0\tilde{N}^c}$ is well above 10^{-2} as $m_{\tilde{Q}_3} \gtrsim 4$ TeV. The mixing between h^0 and H^0_2 varies mildly with increasing of $m_{\tilde{Q}_3}$. Similarly, we also depict $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ and R_{VV^*} versus $m_{\tilde{Q}_3}$ in Fig.7(b). Actually $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ and R_{VV^*} ($V = Z,\ W$) vary mildly with $m_{\tilde{Q}_3}$ when $m_{\tilde{Q}_3} \gtrsim 4$ TeV.




FIG. 8: $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ and R_{VV^*} ($V = Z,\ W$) as a function of $m_{\tilde{L}_3}$, for $\tan\beta = 60$ varying μ such that $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1} = 90$ GeV. Where the Higgs mass m_{h^0} varies with $m_{\tilde{E}_3}$, but satisfies with Eq.(55).

Similar to scenarios in the MSSM, the possible correction to enhance theoretical evaluations on $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ originates from light scalar tau leptons, in which large mixing between left- and right-handed scalar tau leptons is evoked by large values of μ parameter and $\tan\beta$ [45]. In order to enhance the corrections from scalar tau sector to $R_{\gamma\gamma}$, we require the lightest scalar tau has a mass close to the lower bound from LEP collaboration $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1} \gtrsim 90$ GeV. In the MSSM, the elements of scalar tau mass squared matrix are

$$\left(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}}\right)_{LL} \simeq m^2_{\tilde{L}_3} - \frac{1}{2}m^2_{\rm Z}(1 - 2\cos^2\beta)(1 - 2c^2_{\rm W}) + m^2_{\tau}\ ,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}}\Big)_{RR} &\simeq m^2_{\tilde{E}_3} + m^2_{\rm Z} s^2_{\rm W}(1-2\cos^2\beta) + m^2_{\tau}\ , \\
\Big(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}}\Big)_{LR} &\simeq -m_{\tau}\Big(\mu\tan\beta - A_{\tau}\Big)\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{122}$$

Assuming $m_{\tilde{L}_3} = m_{\tilde{E}_3}$ and varying the μ parameter to guarantee the lightest scalar tau $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1} = 90$ GeV, we can derive that the branching ratio of $h^0 \to \gamma\gamma$ is larger than that of the SM for large $\tan\beta$ scenarios in the MSSM. In the MSSM with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry, the elements of scalar tau mass squared matrix are modified as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}}\Big)_{LL} &\simeq m^2_{\tilde{L}_3} - \frac{1}{2}m^2_{\rm Z}(1-2\cos^2\beta)(1-2c^2_{\rm W}) + m^2_{\tau} - \frac{1}{2}m^2_{Z_{BL}}\ , \\
\Big(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}}\Big)_{RR} &\simeq m^2_{\tilde{E}_3} + m^2_{\rm Z} s^2_{\rm W}(1-2\cos^2\beta) + m^2_{\tau} + \frac{1}{2}m^2_{Z_{BL}}\ , \\
\Big(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}}\Big)_{LR} &\simeq -m_{\tau}\Big(\mu\tan\beta - A_{\tau}\Big)\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{123}$$

In order to get a lightest scalar tau $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1} = 90$ GeV for large $\tan\beta$, we cannot adopt the assumption $m_{\tilde{L}_3} \simeq m_{\tilde{E}_3}$ any more because of TeV scale mass of the neutral gauge boson Z_{BL}. In addition, the positive definite condition of 2×2 mass squared matrix $m^2_{\tilde{\tau}}$ also requires $m^2_{\tilde{L}_3} \gtrsim m^2_{Z_{BL}}/2$. Choosing $\tan\beta = 60$, $m_{\tilde{E}_3} = 2$ TeV, and varying μ such that $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1} = 90$ GeV, we plot $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ and R_{VV^*} ($V = Z,\ W$) versus $m_{\tilde{L}_3}$ in Fig.(8). $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ is magnified by the corrections from the lightest scalar tau, and $R_{\gamma\gamma} \simeq 2$ as $m_{\tilde{L}_3} \simeq 1.73$ TeV. However, the fine tuning condition $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1} = 90$ GeV causes that the product $\mu\tan\beta$ turns large rapidly with increasing of $m_{\tilde{L}_3}$. Under our assumptions on parameter space, we find $\mu \simeq 1.2$ TeV as $m_{\tilde{L}_3} = 1.717$ TeV, and $\mu \simeq 5.8$ TeV as $m_{\tilde{L}_3} = 1.732$ TeV, respectively. Meanwhile, the heaviest scalar tau has a TeV scalar mass $m_{\tilde{\tau}_2} \simeq 2.6$ TeV.

VIII. SUMMARY

In the scenarios where sneutrinos all obtain nonzero VEVs, we study the constraints from the observed Higgs signal and neutrino oscillation experimental data on parameter space of the MSSM with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry[9–12]. Considering the constraints from neutrino oscillation, the mixing between real parts of right-handed sneutrinos and the lightest

CP-even Higgs is below 10^{-12} at tree level, and the mixing between real parts of left-handed sneutrinos and the lightest CP-even Higgs is about 10^{-6} at tree level. Including one-loop virtual corrections, we find that the mixing between real parts of right-handed sneutrinos and the lightest CP-even Higgs can reach 1.5×10^{-2}, and this mixing increases the MSSM theoretical evaluation on the mass of the lightest CP-even Higgs exceeding 2.0 GeV. Meanwhile, we can safely neglect the one-loop corrections to the mixing between real parts of left-handed sneutrinos and the lightest CP-even Higgs which are proportional to the tiny nonzero VEVs of left-handed sneutrinos. Numerically the MSSM with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry accommodates naturally the observed Higgs signal from ATLAS/CMS collaborations and the updated experimental data on neutrino oscillation simultaneously. In addition, the model also predicts two sterile neutrinos with sub-eV masses[15, 16] which are favored by the BBN in cosmology[17].

Acknowledgments

The work has been supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NNSFC) with Grant No. 11275243, No. 11275036, No. 11047002, No. 11147001, the open project of State Key Laboratory of Mathematics-Mechanization with Grant No. Y3KF311CJ1, the Natural Science Foundation of Hebei province with Grant No. A2013201277, and Natural Science Foundation of Hebei University with Grant No. 2011JQ05, No. 2012-242.

Appendix A: The mass squared matrices for squarks

With the minimal flavor violation assumption, the 2×2 mass squared matrix for scalar tops is given as

$$\mathcal{Z}_t^{\dagger} \begin{pmatrix} m^2_{\tilde{t}_L} & m^2_{\tilde{t}_X} \\ \\ m^2_{\tilde{t}_X} & m^2_{\tilde{t}_R} \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{Z}_t = diag\Big(m^2_{\tilde{t}_1},\, m^2_{\tilde{t}_2}\Big)\,, \tag{A1}$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
m^2_{\tilde{t}_L} &= \frac{(g_1^2+g_2^2)\upsilon^2_{\rm EW}}{24}\Big(1-2\cos^2\beta\Big)\Big(1-4c^2_{\rm W}\Big) \\
&\quad +\frac{g^2_{BL}}{6}\Big(\upsilon^2_{N}-\upsilon^2_{\rm EW}+\upsilon^2_{\rm SM}\Big)+m^2_{t}+m^2_{\tilde{Q}_3}\ , \\
m^2_{\tilde{t}_R} &= -\frac{g_1^2\upsilon^2_{\rm EW}}{6}\Big(1-2\cos^2\beta\Big) \\
&\quad -\frac{g^2_{BL}}{6}\Big(\upsilon^2_{N}-\upsilon^2_{\rm EW}+\upsilon^2_{\rm SM}\Big)+m^2_{t}+m^2_{\tilde{U}_3}\ , \\
m^2_{\tilde{t}_X} &= -\frac{\upsilon_u}{\sqrt{2}}A_t Y_t+\frac{\mu\upsilon_d}{\sqrt{2}}Y_t\ .
\end{aligned}
\tag{A2}
$$

Here $Y_t,\ A_t$ denote Yukawa coupling and trilinear soft-breaking parameters in top quark sector, respectively. In a similar way, the mass-squared matrix for scalar bottoms is

$$
\mathcal{Z}_b^{\dagger}\begin{pmatrix} m^2_{\tilde{b}_L} & m^2_{\tilde{b}_X} \\ \\ m^2_{\tilde{b}_X} & m^2_{\tilde{b}_R} \end{pmatrix}\mathcal{Z}_b = diag\Big(m^2_{\tilde{b}_1},\ m^2_{\tilde{b}_2}\Big)\ , \tag{A3}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
m^2_{\tilde{b}_L} &= \frac{(g_1^2+g_2^2)\upsilon^2_{\rm EW}}{24}\Big(1-2\cos^2\beta\Big)\Big(1+2c^2_{\rm W}\Big) \\
&\quad +\frac{g^2_{BL}}{6}\Big(\upsilon^2_{N}-\upsilon^2_{\rm EW}+\upsilon^2_{\rm SM}\Big)+m^2_{b}+m^2_{\tilde{Q}_3}\ , \\
m^2_{\tilde{b}_R} &= \frac{g_1^2\upsilon^2_{\rm EW}}{12}\Big(1-2\cos^2\beta\Big) \\
&\quad -\frac{g^2_{BL}}{6}\Big(\upsilon^2_{N}-\upsilon^2_{\rm EW}+\upsilon^2_{\rm SM}\Big)+m^2_{b}+m^2_{\tilde{D}_3}\ , \\
m^2_{\tilde{b}_X} &= \frac{\upsilon_d}{\sqrt{2}}A_b Y_b-\frac{\mu\upsilon_u}{\sqrt{2}}Y_b\ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{A4}
$$

here $Y_b,\ A_b$ denote Yukawa couplings and trilinear soft-breaking parameters in b quark sector, respectively.

Appendix B: The minimization conditions and mass squared matrices for Higgs

The tree level minimization conditions are formulated as

$$
T^0_u=\upsilon_u\Big\{\mu^2+m^2_{H_u}+\frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{8}\Big(2\upsilon^2_u-\upsilon^2_{\rm EW}\Big)+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{3}\Big[\upsilon_{N_\alpha}\Big(Y_N^T Y_N\Big)_{\alpha\beta}\upsilon_{N_\beta}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\upsilon_{L_\alpha}\Big(Y_{_N}Y_{_N}^T\Big)_{\alpha\beta}\upsilon_{L_\beta}\Big]\Big\}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{3}\upsilon_{L_\alpha}\Big(A_{_N}\Big)_{\alpha\beta}\upsilon_{N_\beta}+B\mu\upsilon_{_d}\ ,\\
T_{_d}^0 &= \upsilon_{_d}\Big\{\mu^2+m_{_{H_d}}^2-\frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{8}\Big(2\upsilon_{_u}^2-\upsilon_{\rm EW}^2\Big)\Big\}+\frac{\mu\varepsilon_{_N}^2}{\sqrt{2}}+B\mu\upsilon_{_u}\ ,\\
T_{\tilde{_{L_I}}}^0 &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\Big[\Big(m_{\tilde{_L}}^2\Big)_{I\alpha}+\Big(m_{\tilde{_L}}^2\Big)_{\alpha I}\Big]\upsilon_{L_\alpha}+\frac{\upsilon_{_u}}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\Big(A_{_N}\Big)_{I\alpha}\upsilon_{N_\alpha}+\frac{\mu\upsilon_{_d}}{\sqrt{2}}\zeta_I\\
&\quad+\frac{\varepsilon_{_N}^2\zeta_I}{2}+\frac{\upsilon_{_u}^2}{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\Big(Y_{_N}Y_{_N}^T\Big)_{I\alpha}\upsilon_{L_\alpha}-\upsilon_{L_I}\Big\{\frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{8}\Big(2\upsilon_{_u}^2-\upsilon_{\rm EW}^2\Big)\\
&\quad+\frac{g_{BL}^2}{2}\Big(\upsilon_{_N}^2-\upsilon_{\rm EW}^2+\upsilon_{\rm SM}^2\Big)\Big\}\ ,\\
T_{\tilde{_{N_I}}}^0 &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\Big[\Big(m_{\tilde{_{N^c}}}^2\Big)_{I\alpha}+\Big(m_{\tilde{_{N^c}}}^2\Big)_{\alpha I}\Big]\upsilon_{N_\alpha}+\frac{\upsilon_{_u}}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{L_\alpha}\Big(A_{_N}\Big)_{\alpha I}\\
&\quad+\frac{\mu\upsilon_{_d}}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{L_\alpha}\Big(Y_{_N}\Big)_{\alpha I}+\frac{\varepsilon_{_N}^2}{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{L_\alpha}\Big(Y_{_N}\Big)_{\alpha I}+\frac{\upsilon_{_u}^2}{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{N_\alpha}\Big(Y_{_N}^TY_{_N}\Big)_{\alpha I}\\
&\quad+\frac{g_{BL}^2}{2}\upsilon_{N_I}\Big(\upsilon_{_N}^2-\upsilon_{\rm EW}^2+\upsilon_{\rm SM}^2\Big)\ .
\end{aligned}
\tag{B1}
$$

The radiative corrections from top, bottom and tau sectors to the minimization conditions are

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta T_{_u} &= \frac{3}{(4\pi)^2}\Big\{\Big(Y_{_t}^2-\frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{8}\Big)\Big(f(m_{\tilde{_{t_1}}}^2)+f(m_{\tilde{_{t_2}}}^2)\Big)-2Y_{_t}^2f(m_{_t}^2)\\
&\quad+\Big(Y_{_t}^2A_{_t}(A_{_t}-\mu\frac{\upsilon_{_d}}{\upsilon_{_u}})-\frac{3g_2^2-5g_1^2}{24}(m_{\tilde{_{t_L}}}^2-m_{\tilde{_{t_R}}}^2)\Big)\frac{f(m_{\tilde{_{t_1}}}^2)-f(m_{\tilde{_{t_2}}}^2)}{m_{\tilde{_{t_1}}}^2-m_{\tilde{_{t_2}}}^2}\\
&\quad+\frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{8}\Big(f(m_{\tilde{_{b_1}}}^2)+f(m_{\tilde{_{b_2}}}^2)\Big)\\
&\quad-\Big(Y_{_b}^2\mu(A_{_b}\frac{\upsilon_{_d}}{\upsilon_{_u}}-\mu)-\frac{3g_2^2-g_1^2}{24}(m_{\tilde{_{b_L}}}^2-m_{\tilde{_{b_R}}}^2)\Big)\frac{f(m_{\tilde{_{b_1}}}^2)-f(m_{\tilde{_{b_2}}}^2)}{m_{\tilde{_{b_1}}}^2-m_{\tilde{_{b_2}}}^2}\Big\}\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}\Big\{\frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{8}\Big(f(m_{\tilde{_{\tau_1}}}^2)+f(m_{\tilde{_{\tau_2}}}^2)\Big)-\Big(Y_{_\tau}^2\mu(A_{_\tau}\frac{\upsilon_{_d}}{\upsilon_{_u}}-\mu)\\
&\quad-\frac{g_2^2-3g_1^2}{8}(m_{\tilde{_{\tau_L}}}^2-m_{\tilde{_{\tau_R}}}^2)\Big)\frac{f(m_{\tilde{_{\tau_1}}}^2)-f(m_{\tilde{_{\tau_2}}}^2)}{m_{\tilde{_{\tau_1}}}^2-m_{\tilde{_{\tau_2}}}^2}\Big\}\ ,\\
\Delta T_{_d} &= \frac{3}{(4\pi)^2}\Big\{\frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{8}\Big(f(m_{\tilde{_{t_1}}}^2)+f(m_{\tilde{_{t_2}}}^2)\Big)\\
&\quad-\Big(Y_{_t}^2\mu(A_{_t}\frac{\upsilon_{_u}}{\upsilon_{_d}}-\mu)-\frac{3g_2^2-5g_1^2}{24}(m_{\tilde{_{t_L}}}^2-m_{\tilde{_{t_R}}}^2)\Big)\frac{f(m_{\tilde{_{t_1}}}^2)-f(m_{\tilde{_{t_2}}}^2)}{m_{\tilde{_{t_1}}}^2-m_{\tilde{_{t_2}}}^2}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\Big(Y_{_b}-\frac{g_{_1}^2+g_{_2}^2}{8}\Big)\Big(f(m^2_{\tilde{b}_1})+f(m^2_{\tilde{b}_2})\Big)-2Y_{_b}^2 f(m_{_b}^2)\\
&+\Big(Y_{_b}^2 A_{_b}(A_{_b}-\mu\frac{v_{_u}}{v_{_d}})-\frac{3g_{_2}^2-g_{_1}^2}{24}(m^2_{\tilde{b}_L}-m^2_{\tilde{b}_R})\Big)\frac{f(m^2_{\tilde{b}_1})-f(m^2_{\tilde{b}_2})}{m^2_{\tilde{b}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{b}_2}}\Big\}\\
&+\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}\Big\{\Big(Y_{_\tau}^2-\frac{g_{_1}^2+g_{_2}^2}{8}\Big)\Big(f(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1})+f(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2})\Big)-2Y_{_\tau}^2 f(m_{_\tau}^2)\\
&+\Big(Y_{_\tau}^2 A_{_\tau}(A_{_\tau}-\mu\frac{v_{_u}}{v_{_d}})-\frac{g_{_2}^2-3g_{_1}^2}{8}(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_L}-m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_R})\Big)\frac{f(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1})-f(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2})}{m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2}}\Big\}\,,\\
\Delta T_{_{\tilde{L}}}=&\frac{3}{(4\pi)^2}\Big\{\Big[\frac{g_{_1}^2+g_{_2}^2}{8}\Big(f(m^2_{\tilde{t}_1})+f(m^2_{\tilde{t}_2})\Big)\\
&+\Big(\frac{3g_{_2}^2-5g_{_1}^2}{24}-\frac{g_{BL}^2}{3}\Big)(m^2_{\tilde{t}_L}-m^2_{\tilde{t}_R})\frac{f(m^2_{\tilde{t}_1})-f(m^2_{\tilde{t}_2})}{m^2_{\tilde{t}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{t}_2}}\Big]\\
&-\Big[\frac{g_{_1}^2+g_{_2}^2}{8}\Big(f(m^2_{\tilde{b}_1})+f(m^2_{\tilde{b}_2})\Big)\\
&+\Big(\frac{3g_{_2}^2-g_{_1}^2}{24}+\frac{g_{BL}^2}{3}\Big)(m^2_{\tilde{b}_L}-m^2_{\tilde{b}_R})\frac{f(m^2_{\tilde{b}_1})-f(m^2_{\tilde{b}_2})}{m^2_{\tilde{b}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{b}_2}}\Big]\Big\}\\
&-\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}\Big\{\frac{g_{_1}^2+g_{_2}^2}{8}\Big(f(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1})+f(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2})\Big)\\
&+\Big(\frac{g_{_2}^2-3g_{_1}^2}{8}+g_{BL}^2\Big)(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_L}-m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_R})\frac{f(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1})-f(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2})}{m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2}}\Big\}\,,\\
\Delta T_{_{\tilde{N}}}=&\frac{g_{BL}^2}{16\pi^2}\Big\{(m^2_{\tilde{t}_L}-m^2_{\tilde{t}_R})\frac{f(m^2_{\tilde{t}_1})-f(m^2_{\tilde{t}_2})}{m^2_{\tilde{t}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{t}_2}}+(m^2_{\tilde{b}_L}-m^2_{\tilde{b}_R})\frac{f(m^2_{\tilde{b}_1})-f(m^2_{\tilde{b}_2})}{m^2_{\tilde{b}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{b}_2}}\\
&+(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_L}-m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_R})\frac{f(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1})-f(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2})}{m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2}}\Big\}\,. \qquad \text{(B2)}
\end{aligned}
$$

In the interaction basis $H_{_{CH}}^T=(H_{_u}^-,\ H_{_d}^-,\ \tilde{L}_{_I}^-,\ \tilde{E}_{_J}^{c*})$, $(I,\ J=1,\ 2,\ 3)$, elements of $A_{_{CH}}$ and the symmetric matrix $M^2_{\tilde{E}}$ are written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big[A_{_{CH}}\Big]_{1I'}&=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}(A_{_N})_{I'\alpha}v_{_{N\alpha}}+\frac{v_{_u}}{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}(Y_{_N}Y_{_N}^T)_{I'\alpha}v_{_{L\alpha}}-\frac{g_{_2}^2}{4}v_{_u}v_{_{L_{I'}}}\,,\\
\Big[A_{_{CH}}\Big]_{1(3+J')}&=\frac{\mu}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\Big(Y_{_E}\Big)_{J'\alpha}v_{_{L\alpha}}+\frac{1}{2}v_{_d}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\Big(Y_{_E}^TY_{_N}\Big)_{J'\alpha}v_{_{N\alpha}}\,,\\
\Big[A_{_{CH}}\Big]_{2I'}&=-\frac{g_{_2}^2}{4}v_{_d}v_{_{L_{I'}}}-\frac{\mu\zeta_{_{I'}}}{\sqrt{2}}-\frac{1}{2}v_{_d}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\Big(Y_{_E}Y_{_E}^T\Big)_{I'\alpha}v_{_{L\alpha}}\,,\\
\Big[A_{_{CH}}\Big]_{2(3+J')}&=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}v_{_{L\alpha}}\Big(A_{_E}Y_{_E}\Big)^*_{\alpha J'}+\frac{v_{_u}}{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}v_{_{N\alpha}}\Big(Y_{_E}^TY_{_E}\Big)_{\alpha J'}\,,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big[M^2_{\tilde{E}}\Big]_{II'} &= \Big(m^2_{\tilde{L}}\Big)_{II'} - \frac{g_1^2-g_2^2}{8}\Big(2\upsilon_{_u}^2-\upsilon_{\rm EW}^2\Big)\delta_{II'} - \frac{g_2^2}{4}\upsilon_{_{L_I}}\upsilon_{_{L_{I'}}} + \frac{\upsilon_{_d}^2}{2}\Big(Y_{_E}Y_{_E}^T\Big)_{I'I} \\
&\quad -\frac{1}{2}\zeta_{_I}\zeta_{_{I'}} - \frac{g_{BL}^2}{2}\Big(\upsilon_{_N}^2-\upsilon_{\rm EW}^2+\upsilon_{\rm SM}^2\Big)\delta_{II'} + \Delta T_{_L}\delta_{II'}\ , \\
\Big[M^2_{\tilde{E}}\Big]_{I(3+J')} &= \frac{\upsilon_{_d}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(A_{_E}Y_{_E}\Big)_{IJ'} - \frac{\mu\upsilon_{_u}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(Y_{_E}^T\Big)_{J'I}\ , \\
\Big[M^2_{\tilde{E}}\Big]_{(3+J)(3+J')} &= \Big(m^2_{\tilde{E}}\Big)_{J'J} + \frac{g_1^2}{4}\Big(2\upsilon_{_u}^2-\upsilon_{\rm EW}^2\Big)\delta_{J'J} + \frac{g_{BL}^2}{2}\Big(\upsilon_{_N}^2-\upsilon_{\rm EW}^2+\upsilon_{\rm SM}^2\Big)\delta_{J'J} \\
&\quad +\frac{1}{2}\upsilon_{_d}^2\Big(Y_{_E}^TY_{_E}\Big)_{J'J} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{3}\Big(Y_{_E}^T\Big)_{J'\alpha}\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}\upsilon_{_{L_\beta}}\Big(Y_{_E}\Big)_{\beta J}\ .
\end{aligned}
\tag{B3}
$$

In the interaction basis $P^{0,T} = (P^0_{_u},\ P^0_{_d},\ P^0_{\tilde{L}_I},\ P^0_{\tilde{N}_J})$, $(I,\ J = 1,\ 2,\ 3)$, elements of A_{CPO} are written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big[A^{(0)}_{CPO}\Big]_{1I'} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}(A_{_N})_{I'\alpha}\upsilon_{_{N_\alpha}}\ , \\
\Big[A^{(0)}_{CPO}\Big]_{1(3+J')} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}(A_{_N})_{\alpha J'}\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}\ , \\
\Big[A^{(0)}_{CPO}\Big]_{2I'} &= -\frac{\mu}{\sqrt{2}}\zeta_{_{I'}}\ , \\
\Big[A^{(0)}_{CPO}\Big]_{2(3+J')} &= -\frac{\mu}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}\Big(Y_{_N}\Big)_{\alpha J'}\ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{B4}
$$

and elements of the symmetric matrix $M^2_{_P}$ are similarly given as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big[M^2_{_P}\Big]_{II'} &= \Big(m^2_{\tilde{L}}\Big)_{II'} - \frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{8}\Big(2\upsilon_{_u}^2-\upsilon_{\rm EW}^2\Big)\delta_{II'} - \frac{g_{BL}^2}{2}\Big(\upsilon_{_N}^2-\upsilon_{\rm EW}^2+\upsilon_{\rm SM}^2\Big)\delta_{II'} \\
&\quad +\Delta T_{_L}\delta_{II'} + \Big[\delta^2 m^{odd}_{LL}\Big]_{II'}\ , \\
\Big[M^2_{_P}\Big]_{I(3+J')} &= \Big[\delta^2 m^{odd}_{LR}\Big]_{IJ'}\ , \\
\Big[M^2_{_P}\Big]_{(3+J)(3+J')} &= \Big(m^2_{\tilde{N}^c}\Big)_{JJ'} + \frac{g_{BL}^2}{2}\Big(\upsilon_{_N}^2-\upsilon_{\rm EW}^2+\upsilon_{\rm SM}^2\Big)\delta_{JJ'} + \Delta T_{_N}\delta_{JJ'} \\
&\quad +\Big[\delta^2 m^{odd}_{RR}\Big]_{JJ'}\ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{B5}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big[\delta^2 m^{odd}_{LL}\Big]_{II'} &= -\frac{1}{2}\zeta_{_I}\zeta_{_{I'}} - \frac{1}{2}\Big(Y_{_N}Y_{_N}^T\Big)_{II'}\upsilon_{_u}^2\ , \\
\Big[\delta^2 m^{odd}_{LR}\Big]_{IJ'} &= \frac{\upsilon_{_u}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(A_{_N}\Big)_{IJ'} + \frac{\mu\upsilon_{_d}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(Y_{_N}\Big)_{IJ'} + \frac{\varepsilon_{_N}^2}{2}\Big(Y_{_N}\Big)_{IJ'} \\
&\quad -\frac{1}{2}\zeta_{_I}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}\Big(Y_{_N}^T\Big)_{J'\alpha}\ ,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\Big[\delta^2 m^{odd}_{RR}\Big]_{JJ'} = -\frac{1}{2}\upsilon_u^2\Big(Y_N^T Y_N\Big)_{JJ'} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{3}\Big(Y_N^T\Big)_{J\alpha}\upsilon_{L_\alpha}\upsilon_{L_\beta}\Big(Y_N\Big)_{\beta J'} \,. \tag{B6}$$

Correspondingly the 6×6 matrix is approximated as

$$Z_P \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \Big[\frac{[\delta^2 m^{odd}_{HL}]_{I'}}{m^2_{A^0_{3+I'}} - m^2_{A^0_3}}\Big]_{1\times 3} & 0_{1\times 2} \\ \Big[\frac{[\delta^2 m^{odd}_{HL}]_{I}}{m^2_{A^0_{3+I}} - m^2_{A^0_3}}\Big]_{3\times 1} & \Big[(Z^P_{\tilde{L}})_{II'}\Big]_{3\times 3} & \Big[\frac{[(\delta^2 m^{odd}_{LR})\mathcal{Z}^P_{\tilde{N}^c}]_{I(i'+1)}}{m^2_{A^0_{6+i'}} - m^2_{A^0_{3+I}}}\Big]_{3\times 2} \\ 0_{2\times 1} & \Big[\frac{[(\delta^2 m^{odd}_{LR})\mathcal{Z}^P_{\tilde{N}^c}]_{I'(i+1)}}{m^2_{A^0_{3+I'}} - m^2_{A^0_{6+i}}}\Big]_{2\times 3} & \Big[(Z^P_{\tilde{R}})_{ii'}\Big]_{2\times 2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B7}$$

where

$$Z^P_{\tilde{L}} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{[\delta^2 m^{odd}_{LL}]_{12}}{m^2_{A^0_5} - m^2_{A^0_4}} & \frac{[\delta^2 m^{odd}_{LL}]_{13}}{m^2_{A^0_6} - m^2_{A^0_4}} \\ \frac{[\delta^2 m^{odd}_{LL}]_{12}}{m^2_{A^0_4} - m^2_{A^0_5}} & 1 & \frac{[\delta^2 m^{odd}_{LL}]_{23}}{m^2_{A^0_6} - m^2_{A^0_5}} \\ \frac{[\delta^2 m^{odd}_{LL}]_{13}}{m^2_{A^0_4} - m^2_{A^0_6}} & \frac{[\delta^2 m^{odd}_{LL}]_{23}}{m^2_{A^0_5} - m^2_{A^0_6}} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$Z^P_{\tilde{R}} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{[\mathcal{Z}^{P,T}_{\tilde{N}^c}(\delta^2 m^{odd}_{LR})\mathcal{Z}^P_{\tilde{N}^c}]_{23}}{m^2_{A^0_8} - m^2_{A^0_7}} \\ \frac{[\mathcal{Z}^{P,T}_{\tilde{N}^c}(\delta^2 m^{odd}_{LR})\mathcal{Z}^P_{\tilde{N}^c}]_{32}}{m^2_{A^0_7} - m^2_{A^0_8}} & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{B8}$$

In the interaction basis $H^{0,T} = (H^0_u,\ H^0_d,\ \tilde{\nu}_{L_I},\ \tilde{\nu}_{R_J})$, $(I,\ J = 1,\ 2,\ 3)$, elements of the matrix $A^{(0)}_{CPE}$ are respectively written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big(A^{(0)}_{CPE}\Big)_{1I'} &= -\frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{4}\upsilon_u\upsilon_{L_{I'}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}(A_N)_{I'\alpha}\upsilon_{N_\alpha} - \upsilon_u\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{L_\alpha}\Big(Y_N Y_N^T\Big)_{\alpha I'} \,, \\
\Big(A^{(0)}_{CPE}\Big)_{1(3+J')} &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}(A_N)_{\alpha J'}\upsilon_{L_\alpha} - \upsilon_u\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{N_\alpha}\Big(Y_N^T Y_N\Big)_{\alpha J'} \,, \\
\Big(A^{(0)}_{CPE}\Big)_{2I'} &= \frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{4}\upsilon_d\upsilon_{L_{I'}} - \frac{\mu\zeta_{I'}}{\sqrt{2}} \,, \\
\Big(A^{(0)}_{CPE}\Big)_{2(3+J')} &= -\frac{\mu}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{L_\alpha}\Big(Y_N\Big)_{\alpha J'} \,,
\end{aligned} \tag{B9}$$

and elements of the symmetric matrix M_S^2 are similarly given as

$$\Big(M_S^2\Big)_{II'} = \Big(m^2_{\tilde{L}}\Big)_{II'} - \frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{8}\Big(2\upsilon_u^2 - \upsilon^2_{\rm EW}\Big)\delta_{II'} - \frac{g^2_{BL}}{2}\Big(\upsilon_N^2 - \upsilon^2_{\rm EW} + \upsilon^2_{\rm SM}\Big)\delta_{II'}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\Delta T_{_L}\delta_{II'}+\Big[\delta^2 m^{even}_{_{LL}}\Big]_{II'}\,,\\
\Big(M^2_{_S}\Big)_{I(3+J')} &= \Big[\delta^2 m^{even}_{_{LR}}\Big]_{IJ'}\,,\\
\Big(M^2_{_S}\Big)_{(3+J)(3+J')} &= \Big(m^2_{_{\tilde{N}^c}}\Big)_{JJ'}+\frac{g^2_{_{BL}}}{2}\Big[\Big(\upsilon^2_{_N}-\upsilon^2_{_{\rm EW}}+\upsilon^2_{_{\rm SM}}\Big)\delta_{JJ'}+\upsilon_{_{N_J}}\upsilon_{_{N_{J'}}}\Big]\\
&\quad+\Delta T_{_N}\delta_{JJ'}+\Big[\delta^2 m^{even}_{_{RR}}\Big]_{JJ'}\,,
\end{aligned}
\tag{B10}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big[\delta^2 m^{even}_{_{LL}}\Big]_{II'} &= \frac{g^2_1+g^2_2}{4}\upsilon_{_{L_I}}\upsilon_{_{L_{I'}}}-\frac{1}{2}\zeta_{_I}\zeta_{_{I'}}+g^2_{_{BL}}\upsilon_{_{L_I}}\upsilon_{_{L_{I'}}}-\frac{1}{2}\Big(Y_{_N}Y^T_{_N}\Big)_{II'}\upsilon^2_{_u}\,,\\
\Big[\delta^2 m^{even}_{_{LR}}\Big]_{IJ'} &= -g^2_{_{BL}}\upsilon_{_{L_I}}\upsilon_{_{N_{J'}}}-\frac{\upsilon_{_u}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(A_{_N}\Big)_{IJ'}+\frac{\mu\upsilon_{_d}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(Y_{_N}\Big)_{IJ'}\\
&\quad-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2_{_N}\Big(Y_{_N}\Big)_{IJ'}-\frac{1}{2}\zeta_{_I}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}\Big(Y_{_N}\Big)_{\alpha J'}\,,\\
\Big[\delta^2 m^{even}_{_{RR}}\Big]_{JJ'} &= -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{3}\Big(Y^T_{_N}\Big)_{J\alpha}\upsilon_{_{L_\alpha}}\upsilon_{_{L_\beta}}\Big(Y_{_N}\Big)_{\beta J'}-\frac{1}{2}\upsilon^2_{_u}\Big(Y^T_{_N}Y_{_N}\Big)_{JJ'}\,.
\end{aligned}
\tag{B11}
$$

Furthermore,

$$
Z_{_{\tilde{L}}}\simeq\begin{pmatrix}
1 & \frac{[\delta^2 m^{even}_{_{LL}}]_{12}}{m^2_{_{H^0_4}}-m^2_{_{H^0_3}}} & \frac{[\delta^2 m^{even}_{_{LL}}]_{13}}{m^2_{_{H^0_5}}-m^2_{_{H^0_3}}}\\
\frac{[\delta^2 m^{even}_{_{LL}}]_{12}}{m^2_{_{H^0_4}}-m^2_{_{H^0_3}}} & 1 & \frac{[\delta^2 m^{even}_{_{LL}}]_{23}}{m^2_{_{H^0_5}}-m^2_{_{H^0_4}}}\\
\frac{[\delta^2 m^{even}_{_{LL}}]_{13}}{m^2_{_{H^0_3}}-m^2_{_{H^0_5}}} & \frac{[\delta^2 m^{even}_{_{LL}}]_{23}}{m^2_{_{H^0_4}}-m^2_{_{H^0_5}}} & 1
\end{pmatrix}\,.
\tag{B12}
$$

Appendix C: Radiative corrections to the CP-even Higgs mass squared matrix

The radiative corrections from quark sector are formulated as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta^B_{11} &= \frac{3G_{_F}m^4_{_t}}{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2\sin^2\beta}\Big\{\ln\frac{m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_1}}m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_2}}}{m^4_{_t}}+\frac{2A_{_t}(A_{_t}-\mu\cot\beta)}{m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_1}}-m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_2}}}\ln\frac{m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_1}}}{m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_2}}}\\
&\quad+\frac{A^2_{_t}(A_{_t}-\mu\cot\beta)^2}{(m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_1}}-m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_2}})^2}g(m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_1}},m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_2}})\Big\}\\
&\quad+\frac{3G_{_F}m^4_{_b}}{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2\cos^2\beta}\cdot\frac{\mu^2(A_{_b}-\mu\tan\beta)^2}{(m^2_{_{\tilde{b}_1}}-m^2_{_{\tilde{b}_2}})^2}g(m^2_{_{\tilde{b}_1}},m^2_{_{\tilde{b}_2}})\\
&\quad+\frac{3G_{_F}m^4_{_t}}{16\sqrt{2}\pi^4\sin^2\beta}\Big(\frac{3\pi\alpha m^2_{_t}}{4s^2_{_{\rm W}}m^2_{_{\rm W}}}-8\pi\alpha_{_S}\Big)\ln\frac{m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_1}}m^2_{_{\tilde{t}_2}}}{m^4_{_t}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\times\Big\{\ln\frac{m^2_{\tilde{t}_1}m^2_{\tilde{t}_2}}{m^4_t}+\frac{4(A_t-\mu\cot\beta)^2}{m_{\tilde{t}_1}m_{\tilde{t}_2}}\Big[1-\frac{(A_t-\mu\cot\beta)^2}{12m_{\tilde{t}_1}m_{\tilde{t}_2}}\Big]\Big\}\\
&+\frac{G_F m_b^4}{64\sqrt{2}\pi^4\sin^2\beta\cos^4\beta}\Big(\frac{9\pi\alpha m_b^2}{s_{\rm W}^2 m_{\rm W}^2\cos^2\beta}-\frac{5\pi\alpha m_t^2}{s_{\rm W}^2 m_{\rm W}^2}-32\pi\alpha_S\Big)\ln\frac{m^2_{\tilde{b}_1}m^2_{\tilde{b}_2}}{m_b^4}\ ,\\
\Delta^B_{12}=&-\frac{3G_F m_t^4}{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2\sin^2\beta}\cdot\frac{\mu(A_t-\mu\cot\beta)}{m^2_{\tilde{t}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{t}_2}}\Big\{\ln\frac{m^2_{\tilde{t}_1}}{m^2_{\tilde{t}_2}}\\
&+\frac{A_t(A_t-\mu\cot\beta)}{m^2_{\tilde{t}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{t}_2}}g(m^2_{\tilde{t}_1},m^2_{\tilde{t}_2})\Big\}\\
&-\frac{3G_F m_b^4}{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2\cos^2\beta}\cdot\frac{\mu(A_b-\mu\tan\beta)}{m^2_{\tilde{b}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{b}_2}}\Big\{\ln\frac{m^2_{\tilde{b}_1}}{m^2_{\tilde{b}_2}}\\
&+\frac{A_b(A_b-\mu\tan\beta)}{m^2_{\tilde{b}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{b}_2}}g(m^2_{\tilde{b}_1},m^2_{\tilde{b}_2})\Big\}\ ,\\
\Delta^B_{22}=&\frac{3G_F m_t^4}{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2\sin^2\beta}\cdot\frac{\mu^2(A_t-\mu\cot\beta)^2}{(m^2_{\tilde{t}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{t}_2})^2}g(m^2_{\tilde{t}_1},m^2_{\tilde{t}_2})\\
&+\frac{3G_F m_b^4}{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2\cos^2\beta}\Big\{\ln\frac{m^2_{\tilde{b}_1}m^2_{\tilde{b}_2}}{m_b^4}+\frac{2A_b(A_b-\mu\tan\beta)}{m^2_{\tilde{b}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{b}_2}}\ln\frac{m^2_{\tilde{b}_1}}{m^2_{\tilde{b}_2}}\\
&+\frac{A_b^2(A_b-\mu\tan\beta)^2}{(m^2_{\tilde{b}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{b}_2})^2}g(m^2_{\tilde{b}_1},m^2_{\tilde{b}_2})\Big\}\ .
\end{aligned}
\tag{C1}
$$

Similarly the contributions from lepton sector to the mass-squared matrix of CP-even Higgs are

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta^\tau_{11}=&\frac{G_F m_\tau^4}{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2\cos^2\beta}\cdot\frac{\mu^2(A_\tau-\mu\tan\beta)^2}{(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2})^2}g(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1},m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2})\ ,\\
\Delta^\tau_{12}=&-\frac{G_F m_\tau^4}{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2\cos^2\beta}\cdot\frac{\mu(A_\tau-\mu\tan\beta)}{m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2}}\Big\{\ln\frac{m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1}}{m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2}}\\
&+\frac{A_\tau(A_\tau-\mu\tan\beta)}{m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2}}g(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1},m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2})\Big\}\ ,\\
\Delta^\tau_{22}=&\frac{G_F m_\tau^4}{2\sqrt{2}\pi^2\cos^2\beta}\Big\{\ln\frac{m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1}m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2}}{m_\tau^4}+\frac{2A_\tau(A_\tau-\mu\tan\beta)}{m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2}}\ln\frac{m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1}}{m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2}}\\
&+\frac{A_\tau^2(A_\tau-\mu\tan\beta)^2}{(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1}-m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2})^2}g(m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_1},m^2_{\tilde{\tau}_2})\Big\}\ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{C2}
$$

where

$$
g(x,y)=2-\frac{x+y}{x-y}\ln\frac{x}{y}\ . \tag{C3}
$$

Appendix D: The couplings between CP-even Higgs and charged scalars

The interaction between the CP-even Higgs and charged Higgs is written as

$$\mathcal{L}_{H^0H^+H^-} = \sum_{i=1}^{10}\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{8} \xi^{H^\pm}_{i\beta\alpha} H^0_i H^-_\beta H^+_\alpha \tag{D1}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi^{H^\pm}_{i\beta\alpha} =& \frac{g_1^2+g_2^2}{4}\upsilon_{\rm EW}\mathcal{R}_{1i}A^{H^\pm}_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{g_2^2\upsilon_{\rm EW}}{4}\Big\{\Big[\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{1i}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{2\alpha} + \Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{1\alpha}\Big]\mathcal{V}^*_\beta \\
&+\Big[\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{1i}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta 2} + \Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta 1}\Big]\mathcal{V}_\alpha + 2\mathcal{R}_{1i}\sum_{I=1}^{3}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+I)\alpha}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+I)} \\
&+2\sum_{I=1}^{3}\frac{\upsilon_{L_I}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(2+I)i}\Big[\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{1\alpha}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta 1} - \Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{2\alpha}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta 2}\Big] \\
&+\sum_{I=1}^{3}\Big[\sum_{J=1}^{3}\frac{\upsilon_{L_I}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(2+J)i}\Big[\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+I)\alpha}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+J)} + \Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+J)\alpha}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+I)}\Big] \\
&+\Big[\frac{\upsilon_{L_I}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{1i} + \frac{\upsilon_u}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(2+I)i}\Big]\Big[\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+I)\alpha}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta 1} + \Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{1\alpha}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+I)}\Big] \\
&+\Big[\frac{\upsilon_{L_I}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i} + \frac{\upsilon_d}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(2+I)i}\Big]\Big[\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+I)\alpha}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta 2} + \Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{2\alpha}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+I)}\Big]\Big]\Big\} \\
&+\frac{g_1^2}{2}\upsilon_{\rm EW}\mathcal{R}_{1i}\sum_{I=1}^{3}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(5+I)\alpha}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(5+I)} \\
&+g^2_{BL}\upsilon_t\mathcal{R}_{2i}\sum_{I=1}^{3}\Big[\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+I)\alpha}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+I)} - \Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(5+I)\alpha}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(5+I)}\Big] \\
&+\Big\{\frac{\mu^*}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{I,J}^{3}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+I)\alpha}\Big(Y_N\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(5+J)i}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta 2} \\
&+\frac{\mu}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{I,J}^{3}\Big(Z^T_{H_0}\Big)_{i(5+I)}\Big(Y^\dagger_N\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z^*_{CH}\Big)_{(2+J)\beta}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{2\alpha} \\
&+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{I,J,I'}^{3}\Big[\zeta^*_{I'}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+I')\alpha}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+J)}\Big(Y_N\Big)_{JI}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(5+I)i} \\
&+\Big(Z^T_{H_0}\Big)_{i(5+I)}\Big(Y^\dagger_N\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+J)\alpha}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+I')}\zeta_{I'}\Big\} \\
&+\Big\{-\frac{\mu^*}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{I,J}^{3}\Big(Z^T_{H_0}\Big)_{i1}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+I)}\Big(Y_E\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(5+J)\alpha} \\
&-\frac{\mu}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{I,J}^{3}\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(5+I)}\Big(Y^\dagger_E\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+J)\alpha}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{1i} \\
&+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{I,J}^{3}\sum_{I',J'}^{3}\Big[\Big(Z^\dagger_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(5+I)}\Big(Y^\dagger_E\Big)_{IJ}\upsilon_{L_J}\Big(Z^T_{H_0}\Big)_{i(2+J')}\Big(Y_E\Big)_{J'I'}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(5+I')\alpha}
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(5+I)}\Big(Y^{\dagger}_{E}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(2+J)i}\upsilon_{L_{J'}}\Big(Y_{E}\Big)_{J'I'}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(5+I')\alpha}\Big]\Big\}\\
&+\sum_{I,J}^{3}\Big\{\upsilon_{u}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(5+I)}\Big(Y^{\dagger}_{E}Y_{E}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(5+J)\alpha}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i}\\
&+\frac{1}{2}\Big[\upsilon_{N_I}\Big(Y^{\dagger}_{N}Y_{N}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(5+J)i}+\Big(Z^{T}_{H_0}\Big)_{i(5+I)}\Big(Y^{\dagger}_{N}Y_{N}\Big)_{IJ}\upsilon_{N_J}\Big]\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta1}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{1\alpha}\\
&+\frac{1}{2}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(5+I)}\Big(Y^{\dagger}_{E}Y_{N}\Big)_{IJ}\upsilon_{N_J}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i}\Big[\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{1\alpha}+\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{2\alpha}\Big]\\
&+\frac{1}{2}\upsilon_{\mathrm{EW}}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(5+I)}\Big(Y^{\dagger}_{E}Y_{N}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(5+J)i}\mathcal{V}_{\alpha}\\
&+\frac{1}{2}\Big[\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta1}+\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta2}\Big]\upsilon_{N_I}\Big(Y^{\dagger}_{N}Y_{E}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{(5+J)\alpha}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i}\\
&+\frac{1}{2}\upsilon_{\mathrm{EW}}\mathcal{V}^{*}_{\beta}\Big(Z^{T}_{H_0}\Big)_{i(5+I)}\Big(Y^{\dagger}_{N}Y_{E}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{(5+J)\alpha}\Big\}\\
&+\sum_{I,J}^{3}\Big\{\upsilon_{d}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+I)}\Big(Y^{*}_{E}Y^{T}_{E}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+J)\alpha}\\
&+\frac{1}{2}\Big[\upsilon_{L_I}\Big(Y_{E}Y^{\dagger}_{E}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(2+J)i}+\Big(Z^{T}_{H_0}\Big)_{i(2+I)}\Big(Y_{E}Y^{\dagger}_{E}\Big)_{IJ}\upsilon_{L_J}\Big]\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta2}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{2\alpha}\\
&-\frac{1}{2}\upsilon_{d}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+I)}\Big(Y_{E}Y^{\dagger}_{E}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(2+J)i}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{2\alpha}\\
&-\frac{1}{2}\upsilon_{d}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta2}\Big(Z^{T}_{H_0}\Big)_{i(2+I)}\Big(Y^{*}_{E}Y^{T}_{E}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+J)\alpha}\\
&-\frac{1}{2}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+I)}\Big(Y_{E}Y^{\dagger}_{E}\Big)_{IJ}\upsilon_{L_J}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{2\alpha}\\
&-\frac{1}{2}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta2}\upsilon_{L_I}\Big(Y^{*}_{E}Y^{T}_{E}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+J)\alpha}\Big\}\\
&+\sum_{I,J}^{3}\Big\{\upsilon_{u}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{1i}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+I)}\Big(Y^{*}_{N}Y^{T}_{N}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+J)\alpha}\\
&+\frac{1}{2}\Big[\upsilon_{L_I}\Big(Y_{N}Y^{\dagger}_{N}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(2+J)i}+\Big(Z^{T}_{H_0}\Big)_{i(2+I)}\Big(Y_{N}Y^{\dagger}_{N}\Big)_{IJ}\upsilon_{L_J}\Big]\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta1}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{1\alpha}\\
&-\frac{1}{2}\upsilon_{u}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+I)}\Big(Y_{N}Y^{\dagger}_{N}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(2+J)i}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{1\alpha}\\
&-\frac{1}{2}\upsilon_{u}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta1}\Big(Z^{T}_{H_0}\Big)_{i(2+I)}\Big(Y^{*}_{N}Y^{T}_{N}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+J)\alpha}\\
&-\frac{1}{2}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{1i}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+I)}\Big(Y_{N}Y^{\dagger}_{N}\Big)_{IJ}\upsilon_{L_J}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{1\alpha}\\
&-\frac{1}{2}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{1i}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta1}\upsilon_{L_I}\Big(Y^{*}_{N}Y^{T}_{N}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+J)\alpha}\\
&+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{I,J}^{3}\Big\{\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+I)}\Big(A_{E}Y_{E}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(5+J)\alpha}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i}\\
&+\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(5+I)}\Big(A_{E}Y_{E}\Big)^{\dagger}_{IJ}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+J)\alpha}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta(2+I)}\Big(A_{N}Y_{N}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(5+J)i}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{1\alpha}\\
&+\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{CH}\Big)_{\beta 1}\Big(Z^{T}_{H_0}\Big)_{i(5+I)}\Big(A_{N}Y_{N}\Big)^{\dagger}_{IJ}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+J)\alpha}\Big\}\,. \qquad \text{(D2)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_{1i} &= \frac{\upsilon_{u}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{1i}-\frac{\upsilon_{d}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i}-\sum_{J=1}^{3}\frac{\upsilon_{L_J}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(2+J)i}\,,\\
\mathcal{R}_{2i} &= \sum_{J=1}^{3}\Big[\frac{\upsilon_{L_J}}{\upsilon_{t}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(2+J)i}-\frac{\upsilon_{N_J}}{\upsilon_{t}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(5+J)i}\Big]\,,\\
\mathcal{V}_{\alpha} &= \frac{\upsilon_{u}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{2\alpha}+\frac{\upsilon_{d}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{1\alpha}\,,\\
A^{H^{\pm}}_{\alpha\beta} &= \Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{1\alpha}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{1\beta}-\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{2\alpha}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{2\beta}-\sum_{I=1}^{3}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+I)\alpha}\Big(Z_{CH}\Big)_{(2+I)\beta} \qquad \text{(D3)}
\end{aligned}
$$

and $Y_{E}=\mathrm{diag}(Y_{e},\,Y_{\mu},\,Y_{\tau})$.

The couplings between CP-even Higgs and stops are formulated as

$$
\mathcal{L}_{H^0_i\tilde{t}_\alpha\tilde{t}^{*}_{\beta}}=\sum_{i=1}^{8}\sum_{\alpha,\beta}^{2}\xi^{\tilde{t}}_{i\beta\alpha}H^{0}_{i}\tilde{t}^{*}_{\beta}\tilde{t}_{\alpha}\,, \qquad \text{(D4)}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
\xi^{\tilde{t}}_{i\beta\alpha} = &-\frac{e^2}{4s^2_{\rm W}c^2_{\rm W}}\upsilon_{\rm EW}\mathcal{R}_{1i}\Big\{\Big[1-\Big(1+\mathcal{Y}_{q}\Big)s^2_{\rm W}\Big]\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{\beta 1}\Big(Z_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{1\alpha}\\
&-\mathcal{Y}_{u}s^2_{\rm W}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{\beta 2}\Big(Z_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{2\alpha}\Big\}\\
&-\frac{g^2_{BL}}{3}\upsilon_{t}\mathcal{R}_{2i}\Big\{\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{\beta 1}\Big(Z_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{1\alpha}-\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{\beta 2}\Big(Z_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{2\alpha}\Big\}\\
&+\Big\{\frac{\mu^{*}Y_{t}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{\beta 2}\Big(Z_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{1\alpha}+\frac{\mu Y_{t}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{\beta 1}\Big(Z_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{2\alpha}\\
&+\frac{Y^{*}_{t}}{2}\sum_{I,J}^{3}\Big[\upsilon_{L_I}\Big(Y_{N}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(5+J)i}+\Big(Z^{T}_{H_0}\Big)_{i(5+I)}\Big(Y_{N}\Big)_{IJ}\upsilon_{N_J}\Big]\\
&\times\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{\beta 1}\Big(Z_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{2\alpha}\\
&+\frac{Y_{t}}{2}\sum_{I,J}^{3}\Big[\upsilon_{L_I}\Big(Y^{\dagger}_{N}\Big)_{IJ}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{(5+J)i}+\Big(Z^{T}_{H_0}\Big)_{i(5+I)}\Big(Y^{\dagger}_{N}\Big)_{IJ}\upsilon_{N_J}\Big]\\
&\times\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{\beta 2}\Big(Z_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{1\alpha}\Big\}+\upsilon_{u}|Y_{t}|^2\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{1i}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{\beta 2}\Big(Z_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{2\alpha}\\
&-\frac{A_{t}Y_{t}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{1i}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{\beta 2}\Big(Z_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{1\alpha}-\frac{A^{*}_{t}Y^{*}_{t}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{1i}\Big(Z^{\dagger}_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{\beta 1}\Big(Z_{\tilde{U}^3}\Big)_{2\alpha} \qquad \text{(D5)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mathcal{Y}_{q}=1/3\,,\;\;\mathcal{Y}_{u}=-4/3$.

The couplings between CP-even Higgs and sbottoms are formulated as

$$\mathcal{L}_{H_i^0\tilde{b}_\alpha\tilde{b}_\beta^*} = \sum_{i=1}^{8}\sum_{\alpha,\beta}^{2}\xi_{i\beta\alpha}^{\tilde{b}} H_i^0\tilde{b}_\beta^*\tilde{b}_\alpha \ , \tag{D6}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi_{i\beta\alpha}^{\tilde{b}} = & \frac{e^2}{4s_{\rm W}^2c_{\rm W}^2}v_{\rm EW}\mathcal{R}_{1i}\Big\{\Big[1-\Big(1-\mathcal{Y}_{_q}\Big)s_{\rm W}^2\Big]\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}^{\dagger}\Big)_{\beta 1}\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}\Big)_{1\alpha} \\
& +\mathcal{Y}_{_d}s_{\rm W}^2\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}^{\dagger}\Big)_{\beta 2}\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}\Big)_{2\alpha}\Big\} \\
& -\frac{g_{BL}^2}{3}v_t\mathcal{R}_{2i}\Big\{\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}^{\dagger}\Big)_{\beta 1}\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}\Big)_{1\alpha}-\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}^{\dagger}\Big)_{\beta 2}\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}\Big)_{2\alpha}\Big\} \\
& -\Big\{\frac{\mu Y_{_b}^*}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{1i}\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}^{\dagger}\Big)_{\beta 1}\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}\Big)_{2\alpha}+\frac{\mu^* Y_{_b}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{1i}\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}^{\dagger}\Big)_{\beta 2}\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}\Big)_{1\alpha}\Big\} \\
& +v_{_d}|Y_{_b}|^2\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i}\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}^{\dagger}\Big)_{\beta 2}\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}\Big)_{2\alpha} \\
& +\frac{A_{_b}Y_{_b}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i}\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}^{\dagger}\Big)_{\beta 2}\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}\Big)_{1\alpha}+\frac{A_{_b}^*Y_{_b}^*}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(Z_{H_0}\Big)_{2i}\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}^{\dagger}\Big)_{\beta 1}\Big(Z_{\tilde{D}^3}\Big)_{2\alpha}
\end{aligned} \tag{D7}$$

with $\mathcal{Y}_{_d}=2/3$.

The couplings among CP-even Higgs and charginos/charged leptons are written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{H^0\chi^{\pm}e} = & \sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\sum_{I=1}^{3}[\delta\xi_1^m]_{iI\alpha}H_i^0\overline{e_{_I}}\omega_-\chi_{_\alpha}^- + \sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\sum_{I=1}^{3}[\delta\xi_2^m]_{i\alpha I}H_i^0\overline{\chi_{_\alpha}^-}\omega_-e_{_I} \\
& +\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\sum_{I=1}^{3}\Big\{\frac{\Big(U_-\Big)_{2\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(Y_{_E}V_{_R}\Big)_{KI}+[\delta^2\xi_1^m]_{(2+K)I\alpha}\Big\}H_{_{2+K}}^0\overline{e_{_I}}\omega_-\chi_{_\alpha}^- \\
& +\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\sum_{I=1}^{3}\Big[\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}}\Big(U_+\Big)_{1\alpha}(V_{_L})_{KI}+[\delta^2\xi_2^m]_{(2+K)\alpha I}\Big]H_{_{2+K}}^0\overline{\chi_{_\alpha}^-}\omega_-e_{_I} \\
& +\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\sum_{I=1}^{3}[\delta\xi_2^m]_{(5+K)\alpha I}H_{_{5+K}}^0\overline{\chi_{_\alpha}^-}\omega_-e_{_I} \\
& -\sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{I,J}^{3}\Big\{\frac{\sqrt{2}m_{_{e^I}}}{v_{_d}}\Big(Z_{_R}\Big)_{2i}\delta_{IJ}-[\delta^2\xi_1^e]_{iIJ}\Big\}H_i^0\overline{e_{_I}}\omega_-e_{_J} \\
& +\sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{I,J}^{3}[\delta\xi_1^e]_{(2+K)IJ}H_{_{2+K}}^0\overline{e_{_I}}\omega_-e_{_J}+h.c.
\end{aligned} \tag{D8}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
[\delta\xi_1^m]_{iI\alpha} \simeq & \frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}}\Big[\Big(Z_{_R}\Big)_{2i}\Big(\xi_{_R}V_{_R}\Big)_{1I}\Big(U_-\Big)_{2\alpha}+\Big(Z_{_R}\Big)_{1i}\Big(\xi_{_R}V_{_R}\Big)_{2I}\Big(U_-\Big)_{1\alpha}\Big] \\
& +\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(Z_{_R}\Big)_{2i}\Big(U_-^T\xi_{_L}Y_{_E}V_{_R}\Big)_{\alpha I}
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(U_{-}\Big)_{2\alpha}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\frac{(Z_{R}^{T}A_{CPE})_{iI'}\Big(Y_{E}V_{R}\Big)_{I'I}}{m^2_{H^0_{2+I'}}-m^2_{H^0_i}}\,,\\
[\delta^2\xi_1^m]_{(2+K)I\alpha} &\simeq -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(U_{-}\Big)_{2\alpha}\sum_{I'\neq K}^{3}\frac{(\delta^2 m_{LL}^{even})_{I'K}}{m^2_{H^0_{2+I'}}-m^2_{H^0_{2+K}}}\Big(Y_{E}V_{R}\Big)_{I'I}\\
&\quad+\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}}\sum_{\beta=1}^{2}\Big[\frac{(Z_{R})_{2\beta}(Z_{R}A_{CPE})_{\beta K}}{m^2_{H^0_{2+K}}-m^2_{H^0_\beta}}\Big(\xi_{R}V_{R}\Big)_{1I}\Big(U_{-}\Big)_{2\alpha}\\
&\quad+\frac{(Z_{R})_{1\beta}(Z_{R}A_{CPE})_{\beta K}}{m^2_{H^0_{2+K}}-m^2_{H^0_\beta}}\Big(\xi_{R}V_{R}\Big)_{2I}\Big(U_{-}\Big)_{1\alpha}\Big]\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(U_{-}^{T}\xi_{L}Y_{E}V_{R}\Big)_{\alpha I}\sum_{\beta=1}^{2}\frac{(Z_{R})_{2\beta}(Z_{R}A_{CPE})_{\beta K}}{m^2_{H^0_{2+K}}-m^2_{H^0_\beta}}\,,\\
\Big[\delta\xi_2^m\Big]_{i\alpha I} &\simeq \frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}}\Big[\Big(Z_{R}\Big)_{2i}\Big(\xi_{L}V_{L}\Big)_{2I}\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{1\alpha}+\Big(Z_{R}\Big)_{1i}\Big(\xi_{L}V_{L}\Big)_{1I}\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{2\alpha}\\
&\quad-\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{1\alpha}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\frac{(Z_{R}^{T}A_{CPE})_{iI'}(V_{L})_{I'I}}{m^2_{H^0_{2+I'}}-m^2_{H^0_i}}\Big]+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(Z_{R}\Big)_{2i}\Big(V_{L}^{T}Y_{E}\xi_{R}^{T}U_{+}\Big)_{I\alpha}\,,\\
[\delta^2\xi_2^m]_{(2+K)\alpha I} &\simeq \frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}}\Big\{\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{1\alpha}\frac{(\delta^2 m_{LL}^{even})_{IK}}{m^2_{H^0_{2+K}}-m^2_{H^0_{2+I}}}(1-\delta_{IK})\\
&\quad-\cos\beta\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{1\alpha}\Big(\xi_{L}V_{L}\Big)_{2I}\frac{\upsilon_{L_K}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}+\sin\beta\Big(U_{-}\Big)_{1\alpha}\Big(\xi_{R}V_{R}\Big)_{2I}\frac{\upsilon_{L_K}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}\Big\}\\
&\quad-\frac{\cos\beta}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{\upsilon_{L_K}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}\Big(V_{L}^{T}Y_{E}\xi_{R}^{T}U_{+}\Big)_{I\alpha}-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{2\alpha}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\frac{\upsilon_{N_{I'}}\upsilon_{L_K}}{\upsilon_{N}^2}\Big(Y_{N}V_{L}\Big)_{I'I}\,,\\
\Big[\delta\xi_2^m\Big]_{(5+K)\alpha I} &\simeq \frac{\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{2\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big((\mathcal{Z}_{\tilde{N}^c}^{T})Y_{N}V_{L}\Big)_{KI}\,,\\
\Big[\delta^2\xi_1^e\Big]_{iIJ} &\simeq \frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}}\Big(\xi_{R}V_{R}\Big)_{1I}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\Big(V_{L}\Big)_{I'J}\frac{(A_{CPE}^{T}Z_{R})_{I'i}}{m^2_{H^0_{2+I'}}-m^2_{H^0_i}}\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\xi_{L}V_{L}\Big)_{2J}\sum_{I',J'}^{3}\Big(Y_{E}V_{R}\Big)_{I'I}\frac{(A_{CPE}^{T}Z_{R})_{I'i}}{m^2_{H^0_{2+I'}}-m^2_{H^0_i}}\,,\\
\Big[\delta\xi_1^e\Big]_{(2+K)IJ} &\simeq \frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}}\Big(\xi_{R}V_{R}\Big)_{1I}\Big(V_{L}\Big)_{KJ}\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\xi_{L}V_{L}\Big)_{2J}\sum_{J'=1}^{3}\Big(Y_{E}\Big)_{KJ'}\Big(V_{R}\Big)_{J'I}\,.
\end{aligned}
\tag{D9}
$$

The couplings between CP-odd Higgs and charginos/charged leptons are

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{A^0\chi^\pm e} = & \sum_{i=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\sum_{I=1}^{3} A_i^0\Big\{[\delta\eta_1^m]_{iI\alpha}\overline{e_I}\omega_-\chi_\alpha^- - [\delta\eta_1^m]^*_{iI\alpha}\overline{\chi_\alpha^-}\omega_+ e_I\Big\} \\
& + \sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\sum_{I=1}^{3} A_{3+K}^0\Big\{\Big[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(U_-\Big)_{2\alpha}\Big(Y_{_E}V_{_R}\Big)_{KI} + [\delta^2\eta_1^m]_{(3+K)I\alpha}\Big]\overline{e_I}\omega_-\chi_\alpha^- \\
& - \Big[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(U_-\Big)^*_{2\alpha}\Big(Y_{_E}V_{_R}\Big)^*_{KI} + [\delta^2\eta_1^m]^*_{(3+K)I\alpha}\Big]\overline{\chi_\alpha^-}\omega_+ e_I\Big\} \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\sum_{I=1}^{3} A_{6+i}^0\Big\{[\delta\eta_1^m]_{(6+i)I\alpha}\overline{e_I}\omega_-\chi_\alpha^- - \Big[\delta\eta_1^m\Big]^*_{(6+i)I\alpha}\overline{\chi_\alpha^-}\omega_+ e_I\Big\} \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\sum_{I=1}^{3} A_i^0\Big\{[\delta\eta_2^m]_{i\alpha I}\overline{\chi_\alpha^-}\omega_- e_I - [\delta\eta_2^m]^*_{i\alpha I}\overline{e_I}\omega_+\chi_\alpha^-\Big\} \\
& + \sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\sum_{I=1}^{3} A_{3+K}^0\Big\{\Big[\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{_W}}\Big(U_+\Big)_{1\alpha}(V_{_L})_{KI} + [\delta^2\eta_2^m]_{(3+K)\alpha I}\Big]\overline{\chi_\alpha^-}\omega_- e_I \\
& - \Big[\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{_W}}\Big(U_+\Big)^*_{1\alpha}(V_{_L})^*_{KI} + [\delta^2\eta_2^m]^*_{(3+K)\alpha I}\Big]\overline{e_I}\omega_+\chi_\alpha^-\Big\} \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\sum_{I=1}^{3} A_{6+i}^0\Big\{[\delta\eta_2^m]_{(6+i)\alpha I}\overline{\chi_\alpha^-}\omega_- e_I - [\delta\eta_2^m]^*_{(6+i)\alpha I}\overline{e_I}\omega_+\chi_\alpha^-\Big\} \\
& + \sum_{I,J}^{3} A_1^0\Big\{\Big[\frac{\sqrt{2}m_{_{eI}}}{v_{_d}}\cos\beta\delta_{IJ} + [\delta^2\eta^e]_{1IJ}\Big]\overline{e_I}\omega_- e_J \\
& - \Big[\frac{\sqrt{2}m_{_{eI}}}{v_{_d}}\cos\beta\delta_{IJ} + [\delta^2\eta^e]^*_{1IJ}\Big]\overline{e_J}\omega_+ e_I\Big\} \\
& + \sum_{I,J}^{3} A_3^0\Big\{\Big[-\frac{\sqrt{2}m_{_{eI}}}{v_{_d}}\sin\beta\delta_{IJ} + [\delta^2\eta^e]_{3IJ}\Big]\overline{e_I}\omega_- e_J \\
& - \Big[-\frac{\sqrt{2}m_{_{eI}}}{v_{_d}}\sin\beta\delta_{IJ} + [\delta^2\eta^e]^*_{3IJ}\Big]\overline{e_J}\omega_+ e_I\Big\} \\
& + \sum_{K=1}^{3}\sum_{I,J}^{3} A_{3+K}^0\Big\{[\delta\eta^e]_{(3+K)IJ}\overline{e_I}\omega_- e_J - [\delta\eta^e]^*_{(3+K)IJ}\overline{e_J}\omega_+ e_I\Big\}
\end{aligned}
\tag{D10}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big[\delta\eta_1^m\Big]_{1I\alpha} &\simeq \frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{_W}}\Big[-\cos\beta\Big(\xi_{_R}V_{_R}\Big)_{1I}\Big(U_-\Big)_{2\alpha} + \sin\beta\Big(\xi_{_R}V_{_R}\Big)_{2I}\Big(U_-\Big)_{1\alpha}\Big] \\
&\quad -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\cos\beta\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\Big(Y_{_E}V_{_R}\Big)_{I'I}\Big(\xi_{_L}^T U_-\Big)_{I'\alpha} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(U_-\Big)_{2\alpha}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\frac{v_{_{L_{I'}}}}{v_{_{\rm EW}}}\Big(Y_{_E}V_{_R}\Big)_{I'I}\,, \\
\Big[\delta\eta_1^m\Big]_{2I\alpha} &\simeq 0\,, \\
\Big[\delta\eta_1^m\Big]_{3I\alpha} &\simeq \frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{_W}}\Big[\sin\beta\Big(\xi_{_R}V_{_R}\Big)_{1I}\Big(U_-\Big)_{2\alpha} + \cos\beta\Big(\xi_{_R}V_{_R}\Big)_{2I}\Big(U_-\Big)_{1\alpha}\Big]
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sin\beta\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\Big(Y_{_E}V_{_R}\Big)_{I'I}\Big(\xi_{_L}^{T}U_{-}\Big)_{I'\alpha}\\
&-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(U_{-}\Big)_{2\alpha}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\frac{(\delta^2 m_{HL}^{odd})_{I'}}{m^2_{_{A^0_{3+I'}}}-m^2_{_{A^0_3}}}\Big(Y_{_E}V_{_R}\Big)_{I'I}\,,\\
[\delta^2\eta_1^m]_{(3+K)I\alpha}&\simeq\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(U_{-}\Big)_{2\alpha}\sum_{I'\neq K}^{3}\frac{(\delta^2 m_{LL}^{odd})_{I'K}}{m^2_{_{A^0_{3+K}}}-m^2_{_{A^0_{3+I'}}}}\Big(Y_{_E}V_{_R}\Big)_{I'I}\,,\\
[\delta\eta_1^m]_{(6+i)I\alpha}&\simeq\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(U_{-}\Big)_{2\alpha}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\frac{(\delta^2 m_{LR}^{odd}\mathcal{Z}^{P}_{\tilde{N}^c})_{I'i}}{m^2_{_{A^0_{6+i}}}-m^2_{_{A^0_{3+I'}}}}\Big(Y_{_E}V_{_R}\Big)_{I'I}\,,\quad(i=1,\,2)\,,\\
[\delta\eta_2^m]_{1\alpha I}&\simeq\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{_{\rm W}}}\Big[-\cos\beta\Big(\xi_{_L}V_{_L}\Big)_{2I}\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{1\alpha}+\sin\beta\Big(\xi_{_L}V_{_L}\Big)_{1I}\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{2\alpha}\\
&\quad-\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{1\alpha}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\frac{\upsilon_{_{L_{I'}}}}{\upsilon_{_{\rm EW}}}\Big(V_{_L}\Big)_{I'I}\Big]-\frac{\cos\beta}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(V_{_L}^{T}Y_{_E}\xi_{_R}^{T}U_{+}\Big)_{I\alpha}\,,\\
[\delta\eta_2^m]_{2\alpha I}&\simeq-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\upsilon_{_N}}\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{2\alpha}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\zeta_{_{I'}}\Big(V_{_L}\Big)_{I'I}\,,\\
[\delta\eta_2^m]_{3\alpha I}&\simeq\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{_{\rm W}}}\Big[\sin\beta\Big(\xi_{_L}V_{_L}\Big)_{2I}\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{1\alpha}+\cos\beta\Big(\xi_{_L}V_{_L}\Big)_{1I}\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{2\alpha}\\
&\quad-\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{1\alpha}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\frac{(\delta^2 m_{HL}^{odd})_{(3+I')}}{m^2_{_{A^0_{I'}}}-m^2_{_{A^0_3}}}\Big(V_{_L}\Big)_{I'I}\Big]+\frac{\sin\beta}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(V_{_L}^{T}Y_{_E}\xi_{_R}^{T}U_{+}\Big)_{I\alpha}\,,\\
[\delta^2\eta_2^m]_{(3+K)\alpha I}&\simeq\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{_{\rm W}}}\Big\{\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{1\alpha}\frac{(\delta^2 m_{LL}^{odd})_{IK}}{m^2_{_{A^0_{3+K}}}-m^2_{_{A^0_{3+I}}}}(1-\delta_{IK})\\
&\quad-\cos\beta\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{1\alpha}\Big(\xi_{_L}V_{_L}\Big)_{2I}\frac{\upsilon_{_{L_K}}}{\upsilon_{_{\rm EW}}}+\sin\beta\Big(U_{-}\Big)_{1\alpha}\Big(\xi_{_R}V_{_R}\Big)_{2I}\frac{\upsilon_{_{L_K}}}{\upsilon_{_{\rm EW}}}\Big\}\\
&\quad-\frac{\cos\beta}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{\upsilon_{_{L_K}}}{\upsilon_{_{\rm EW}}}\Big(V_{_L}^{T}Y_{_E}\xi_{_R}^{T}U_{+}\Big)_{I\alpha}-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{2\alpha}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\frac{\upsilon_{_{N_{I'}}}\upsilon_{_{L_K}}}{\upsilon_{_N}^2}\Big(Y_{_N}V_{_L}\Big)_{I'I}\,,\\
[\delta\eta_2^m]_{(6+i)\alpha I}&\simeq\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(U_{+}\Big)_{2\alpha}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\frac{(\delta^2 m_{LR}^{odd}\mathcal{Z}^{P}_{\tilde{N}^c})_{I'i}}{m^2_{_{A^0_{6+i}}}-m^2_{_{A^0_{3+I'}}}}\Big(V_{_R}\Big)_{I'I}\,,\quad(i=1,\,2)\,,\\
[\delta^2\eta^e]_{1IJ}&\simeq-\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{_{\rm W}}}\Big(\xi_{_R}V_{_R}\Big)_{1I}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\frac{\upsilon_{_{L_{I'}}}}{\upsilon_{_{\rm EW}}}\Big(V_{_L}\Big)_{I'J}-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\xi_{_L}V_{_L}\Big)_{2J}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\frac{\upsilon_{_{L_{I'}}}}{\upsilon_{_{\rm EW}}}\Big(Y_{_E}V_{_R}\Big)_{I'I}\,,\\
[\delta^2\eta^e]_{3IJ}&\simeq\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{_{\rm W}}}\Big(\xi_{_R}V_{_R}\Big)_{1I}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\frac{(\delta^2 m_{HL}^{odd})_{(I')}}{m^2_{_{A^0_{3+I'}}}-m^2_{_{A^0_3}}}\Big(V_{_L}\Big)_{I'J}\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\xi_{_L}V_{_L}\Big)_{2J}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\frac{(\delta^2 m_{HL}^{odd})_{(I')}}{m^2_{_{A^0_{3+I'}}}-m^2_{_{A^0_3}}}\Big(Y_{_E}V_{_R}\Big)_{I'I}\,.
\end{aligned}
\tag{D11}
$$

The couplings between charged Higgs, charged leptons and neutralinos/neutrinos are

formulated as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{H^-\overline{e}\chi^0} = &\sum_{I=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{5} G^-\overline{e_I}\Big\{\Big[\cos\beta(Z_\nu^T Y_{_E} V_{_R})_{\alpha I} + \sum_{b=1}^{5}[\delta^2\zeta_G^L]_{1Ib}(Z_\nu)_{b\alpha}\Big]\omega_- \\
&+\sum_{b=1}^{5}[\delta^2\zeta_G^R]_{1Ib}(Z_\nu)^*_{b\alpha}\omega_+\Big\}\nu_\alpha \\
&+\sum_{I=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{5} H^-\overline{e_I}\Big\{\Big[-\sin\beta(Z_\nu^T Y_{_E} V_{_R})_{\alpha I} + \sum_{b=1}^{5}[\delta^2\zeta_H^L]_{2Ib}(Z_\nu)_{b\alpha}\Big]\omega_- \\
&+\sum_{b=1}^{5}[\delta^2\zeta_H^R]_{2Ib}(Z_\nu)^*_{b\alpha}\omega_+\Big\}\nu_\alpha \\
&+\sum_{I,J}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{5}\sum_{b=1}^{5}\tilde{L}_J^-\overline{e_I}\Big\{[\delta\zeta_{\tilde{L}}^L]_{JIb}(Z_\nu)_{b\alpha}\omega_- + [\delta\zeta_{\tilde{L}}^R]_{JIb}(Z_\nu)^*_{b\alpha}\omega_+\Big\}\nu_\alpha \\
&+\sum_{I,J}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{5}\sum_{b=1}^{5}\tilde{R}_J^-\overline{e_I}\Big\{[\delta\zeta_{\tilde{R}}^L]_{JIb}(Z_\nu)_{b\alpha}\omega_- + [\delta\zeta_{\tilde{R}}^R]_{JIb}(Z_\nu)^*_{b\alpha}\omega_+\Big\}\nu_\alpha \\
&+\sum_{I=1}^{3}\sum_{\beta=1}^{4} G^-\overline{e_I}\Big\{[\delta\zeta_G^L]_{1I\chi_\beta^0}\omega_- + [\delta\zeta_G^R]_{1I\chi_\beta^0}\omega_+\Big\}\chi_\beta^0 \\
&+\sum_{I=1}^{3}\sum_{\beta=1}^{4} H^-\overline{e_I}\Big\{[\delta\zeta_H^L]_{2I\chi_\beta^0}\omega_- + [\delta\zeta_H^R]_{2I\chi_\beta^0}\omega_+\Big\}\chi_\beta^0 \\
&+\sum_{I,J}^{3}\sum_{\beta=1}^{4}\tilde{L}_J^-\overline{e_I}\Big\{\Big[\frac{e\sqrt{2}}{c_{\rm W}}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{21}\Big(V_{_R}\Big)_{JI}(U_\chi)_{1\beta} \\
&+(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{JI}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{11}(U_\chi)_{3\beta} + [\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde{L}}^L]_{JI\chi_\beta^0}\Big]\omega_- \\
&+\Big[-\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{11}\Big(V_{_L}\Big)^*_{JI}\Big[c_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{2\beta} + s_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{1\beta}\Big] \\
&+(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{21}(V_{_L}^\dagger Y_{_E})_{IJ}(U_\chi)^*_{3\beta} + [\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde{L}}^R]_{JI\chi_\beta^0}\Big]\omega_+\Big\}\chi_\beta^0 \\
&+\sum_{I,J}^{3}\sum_{\beta=1}^{4}\tilde{R}_J^-\overline{e_I}\Big\{\Big[\frac{e\sqrt{2}}{c_{\rm W}}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{22}\Big(V_{_R}\Big)_{JI}(U_\chi)_{1\beta} \\
&+(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{JI}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{12}(U_\chi)_{3\beta} + [\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde{R}}^L]_{JI\chi_\beta^0}\Big]\omega_- \\
&+\Big[-\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{12}\Big(V_{_L}\Big)^*_{JI}\Big(c_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{2\beta} + s_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{1\beta}\Big) \\
&+(V_{_L}^\dagger Y_{_E})_{IJ}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{21}(U_\chi)^*_{3\beta} + [\delta^2\zeta_{\tilde{R}}^R]_{JI\chi_\beta^0}\Big]\omega_+\Big\}\chi_\beta^0 + h.c. \qquad \text{(D12)}
\end{aligned}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
[\delta^2\zeta_G^L]_{1Ib} \simeq -\frac{e\sin\beta}{s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}\Big[&\frac{c_{\rm W}}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{2I}\Big(\delta U_\chi\Big)_{2b} + \frac{s_{\rm W}}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{2I}\Big(\delta U_\chi\Big)_{1b} \\
&+c_{\rm W}(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{1I}\Big(\delta U_\chi\Big)_{4b}\Big]
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{\cos\beta}{2}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\Big[(Y_{_E}\xi_{_R}^{T}\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{I'I}\delta_{I'b}+(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{I'I}\Big(\delta^2\chi_{_D}\Big)_{I'b}\Big]\,,\\
[\delta^2\zeta_{_G}^{R}]_{1Ib}&\simeq\frac{e\cos\beta}{s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}\Big[\frac{c_{\rm W}}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^{*}_{2I}\Big(\delta U_{\chi}\Big)_{2b}+\frac{s_{\rm W}}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^{*}_{2I}\Big(\delta U_{\chi}\Big)_{1b}\\
&\quad-c_{\rm W}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^{*}_{1I}\Big(\delta U_{\chi}\Big)_{3b}\Big]\,,\\
[\delta^2\zeta_{_H}^{L}]_{2Ib}&\simeq\frac{e}{s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}\Big\{-\cos\beta\Big[(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{2I}\Big(\frac{c_{\rm W}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\delta U_{\chi}\Big)_{2b}+\frac{s_{\rm W}}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(\delta U_{\chi}\Big)_{1b}\Big)\\
&\quad+c_{\rm W}(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{1I}\Big(\delta U_{\chi}\Big)_{4b}\Big]+\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}\sum_{J=1}^{3}(\varepsilon'_{_E})_{3+J}(V_{_R})_{JI}\Big(\delta U_{\chi}\Big)_{1b}\Big\}\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\Big\{\sin\beta\Big[(Y_{_E}\xi_{_R}^{T}\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{I'I}\delta_{I'b}+(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{I'I}\Big(\delta^2\chi_{_D}\Big)_{I'b}\Big]\\
&\quad+2(\varepsilon'_{_E})_{I'}(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{I'I}\Big(\delta U_{\chi}\Big)_{3b}\Big\}\,,\\
[\delta^2\zeta_{_H}^{R}]_{2Ib}&\simeq\frac{e}{s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}\Big\{\sin\beta\Big[(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^{*}_{2I}\Big(\frac{c_{\rm W}}{\sqrt{2}}(\delta U_{\chi})_{2b}+\frac{s_{\rm W}}{\sqrt{2}}(\delta U_{\chi})_{1b}\Big)\\
&\quad-c_{\rm W}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^{*}_{1I}(\delta U_{\chi})_{3b}\Big]-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{J'=1}^{3}(\varepsilon'_{_E})_{J'}(V_{_L})^{*}_{J'I}\Big(c_{\rm W}(\delta U_{\chi})_{2b}\\
&\quad+s_{\rm W}(\delta U_{\chi})_{3b}\Big)\Big\}-\frac{e}{s_{\rm W}}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^{*}_{1I}\sum_{J'=1}^{3}(\varepsilon'_{_E})_{J'}\delta_{J'b}\\
&\quad+\sum_{I',J'}^{3}(Y_{_E})_{I'J'}(\varepsilon'_{_E})_{3+J'}\Big\{(V_{_L})^{*}_{I'I}(\delta U_{\chi})_{3b}+(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^{*}_{1I}\delta_{I'b}\Big\}\,,\\
[\delta\zeta_{\tilde{L}}^{L}]_{JIb}&\simeq\frac{\sqrt{2}e}{c_{\rm W}}(Z_{\tilde{E}_{J}})_{21}(V_{_R})_{JI}(\delta U_{\chi})_{1b}-\sum_{I'=1}^{3}(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{I'I}\Big\{\Big[\sin\beta(\varepsilon'_{_E})_{3+J}\\
&\quad-\cos\beta\frac{\upsilon_{_{L_J}}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}\Big]\delta_{I'b}+\delta_{I'J}(Z_{\tilde{E}_{I'}})_{11}(\delta U_{\chi})_{3b}\Big\}\,,\\
[\delta\zeta_{\tilde{L}}^{R}]_{JIb}&\simeq\frac{e}{s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}(Z_{\tilde{E}_{J}})_{11}\Big\{c_{\rm W}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^{*}_{1I}\delta_{Jb}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(V_{_L})^{*}_{JI}\Big[s_{\rm W}(\delta U_{\chi})_{1b}\\
&\quad+c_{\rm W}(\delta U_{\chi})_{2b}\Big]\Big\}+(Z_{\tilde{E}_{J}})_{21}\Big\{\sum_{I'=1}^{3}(Y_{_E})_{I'I}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^{*}_{1I}\delta_{I'b}\\
&\quad+(V_{_L}^{\dagger}Y_{_E})_{IJ}(\delta U_{\chi})_{3b}\Big\}\,,\\
[\delta\zeta_{\tilde{R}}^{L}]_{JIb}&\simeq\frac{\sqrt{2}e}{c_{\rm W}}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}(Z_{\tilde{E}_{I'}})_{22}(V_{_R})_{JI}(\delta U_{\chi})_{1b}\\
&\quad-\sum_{I'=1}^{3}(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{I'I}\Big[\cos\beta(\varepsilon'_{_E})_{3+J}\delta_{I'b}+\delta_{I'J}(Z_{\tilde{E}_{I'}})_{12}(\delta U_{\chi})_{3b}\Big]\,,\\
[\delta\zeta_{\tilde{R}}^{R}]_{JIb}&\simeq\frac{e}{s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}(Z_{\tilde{E}_{J}})_{12}\Big\{c_{\rm W}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^{*}_{1I}\delta_{Jb}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(V_{_L})^{*}_{JI}\Big[s_{\rm W}(\delta U_{\chi})_{1b}+c_{\rm W}(\delta U_{\chi})_{2b}\Big]\Big\}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$+\sum_{I',J'}^{3}(Y_{_E})_{_{I'J'}}(Z_{_{\tilde{E}_{J'}}})_{22}\Big\{\delta_{IJ'}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^*_{1I}\delta_{I'b}+(V_{_L})^*_{I'I}(\delta U_\chi)_{3b}\Big\}\,,$$

$$[\delta\zeta^L_G]_{_{1I\chi^0_\beta}}\simeq\frac{e\sin\beta}{s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}\Big[\frac{c_{\rm W}}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{2I}(U_\chi)_{2\beta}+\frac{s_{\rm W}}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{2I}(U_\chi)_{1\beta}$$
$$+c_{\rm W}(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{1I}(U_\chi)_{3\beta}\Big]+\sum_{I',J'}^{3}(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{_{I'I}}\Big[\cos\beta\frac{(m_{_D})_{I'(2+\beta)}}{m_{_{\chi^0_\beta}}}-\frac{\upsilon_{_{L'_I}}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}(U_\chi)_{3\beta}\Big]\,,$$

$$[\delta\zeta^R_G]_{_{1I\chi^0_\beta}}\simeq\frac{e\cos\beta}{s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}\Big[\frac{c_{\rm W}}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^*_{2I}(U_\chi)^*_{2\beta}+\frac{s_{\rm W}}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^*_{2I}(U_\chi)^*_{1\beta}$$
$$-c_{\rm W}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^*_{1I}(U_\chi)^*_{3\beta}\Big]+\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\frac{\upsilon_{_{L'_I}}}{\sqrt{2}\upsilon_{\rm EW}}(V_{_L})^*_{I'I}\Big[c_{\rm W}(U_\chi)_{2\beta}+s_{\rm W}(U_\chi)_{1\beta}\Big]\,,$$

$$[\delta\zeta^L_H]_{_{2I\chi^0_\beta}}\simeq\frac{e}{s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}\Big\{\cos\beta\Big[\frac{c_{\rm W}}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{2I}(U_\chi)_{2\beta}+\frac{s_{\rm W}}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{2I}(U_\chi)_{1\beta}$$
$$+c_{\rm W}(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{1I}(U_\chi)_{3\beta}\Big]+\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}(\varepsilon'_{_E})_{_{3+I'}}(V_{_R})_{I'I}(U_\chi)_{1\beta}\Big\}$$
$$-\sum_{I'=1}^{3}(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{_{I'I}}\Big[\sin\beta\frac{(m_{_D})_{I'(2+\beta)}}{m_{_{\chi^0_\beta}}}+(\varepsilon'_{_E})_{_{I'}}(U_\chi)_{3\beta}\Big]\,,$$

$$[\delta\zeta^R_H]_{_{2I\chi^0_\beta}}\simeq-\frac{e}{s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}\Big\{\sin\beta\Big[\frac{c_{\rm W}}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^*_{2I}(U_\chi)^*_{2\beta}+\frac{s_{\rm W}}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^*_{2I}(U_\chi)^*_{1\beta}$$
$$-c_{\rm W}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^*_{1I}(U_\chi)^*_{3\beta}\Big]-\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\varepsilon'_{_E})_{_{I'}}(V_{_L})^*_{I'I}\Big[c_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{2\beta}$$
$$+s_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{1\beta}\Big]\Big\}-\sum_{I'=1}^{3}(V^\dagger_{_L}Y_{_E})_{_{II'}}(\varepsilon'_{_E})_{_{3+I'}}(U_\chi)_{3\beta}\,,$$

$$[\delta^2\zeta^L_{\tilde{L}}]_{_{JI\chi^0_\beta}}\simeq-\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}c_{\rm W}}(Z_{_{\tilde{E}_J}})_{21}\Big[\Big(\xi^T_{_R}\xi_{_R}V_{_R}\Big)_{_{JI}}(U_\chi)_{1\beta}+(V_{_R})_{JI}\Big(\delta^2U_\chi\Big)_{_{1\beta}}\Big]$$
$$-\frac{1}{2}(Z_{_{\tilde{E}_J}})_{11}\Big(Y_{_E}\xi^T_{_R}\xi_{_R}V_{_R}\Big)_{_{JI}}(U_\chi)_{3\beta}-\sum_{I'=1}^{3}(Y_{_E}V_{_R})_{_{I'I}}\Big\{\Big[\sin\beta(\varepsilon'_{_E})_{_{3+J}}$$
$$-\cos\beta\frac{\upsilon_{_{L_J}}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}\Big]\frac{(m_{_D})_{I'(2+\beta)}}{m_{_{\chi^0_\beta}}}-(Z_{_{\tilde{E}_J}})_{11}\delta_{I'J}\Big(\delta^2U_\chi\Big)_{_{1\beta}}\Big\}\,,$$

$$[\delta^2\zeta^R_{\tilde{L}}]_{_{JI\chi^0_\beta}}\simeq\frac{e}{2\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}(Z_{_{\tilde{E}_J}})_{11}\Big(\xi^T_{_L}\xi_{_L}V_{_L}\Big)^*_{JI}\Big[c_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{2\beta}+s_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{1\beta}\Big]$$
$$-\frac{1}{2}(V^\dagger_{_L}\xi^T_{_L}\xi_{_L}Y_{_E})_{_{IJ}}(Z_{_{\tilde{E}_J}})_{21}(U_\chi)^*_{3\beta}$$
$$-\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}\Big\{\Big[\sin\beta(\varepsilon'_{_E})_{_{3+J}}-\cos\beta\frac{\upsilon_{_{L_J}}}{\upsilon_{\rm EW}}\Big]\Big[c_{\rm W}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^*_{2I}(U_\chi)^*_{2\beta}$$
$$+s_{\rm W}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^*_{2I}(U_\chi)^*_{1\beta}-\sqrt{2}c_{\rm W}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^*_{1I}(U_\chi)^*_{3\beta}\Big]$$
$$-(Z_{_{\tilde{E}_J}})_{11}\Big[c_{\rm W}(V_{_L})^*_{JI}(\delta^2U_\chi)^*_{2\beta}+s_{\rm W}(V_{_L})^*_{JI}(\delta^2U_\chi)^*_{1\beta}\Big]$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\sqrt{2}c_{\rm W}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{11}(\xi_L V_L)^*_{1I}\frac{(m_D)_{J(2+\beta)}}{m_{\chi^0_\beta}}\Big\}\\
&-\sum_{I'=1}^{3}(Y_E)_{I'J}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{21}\Big[(\xi_L V_L)^*_{1I}\frac{(m_D)_{I'(2+\beta)}}{m_{\chi^0_\beta}}+(V_L)^*_{I'I}(\delta^2 U_\chi)^*_{3\beta}\Big]\,,\\
[\delta^2\zeta^L_{\tilde{R}}]_{JI\chi^0_\beta}\simeq&-\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}c_{\rm W}}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{22}\Big(\xi^T_R\xi_R V_R\Big)_{JI}(U_\chi)_{1\beta}-\frac{1}{2}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{12}\Big(Y_E\xi^T_R\xi_R V_R\Big)_{JI}(U_\chi)_{3\beta}\\
&+\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}\Big\{\cos\beta(\varepsilon'_E)_{3+J}\Big[c_{\rm W}(\xi_R V_R)_{2I}(U_\chi)_{2\beta}+s_{\rm W}(\xi_R V_R)_{2I}(U_\chi)_{1\beta}\\
&-\sqrt{2}c_{\rm W}(\xi_R V_R)_{1I}(U_\chi)_{4\beta}\Big]-c_{\rm W}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{22}(V_R)_{JI}(\delta^2U_\chi)_{1\beta}\Big\}\\
&-\sum_{I'=1}^{3}(Y_E V_R)_{I'I}\Big[\sin\beta(\varepsilon'_E)_{3+J}\frac{(m_D)_{I'(2+\beta)}}{m_{\chi^0_\beta}}+\delta_{I'J}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{12}(\delta^2U_\chi)^*_{3\beta}\Big]\,,\\
[\delta^2\zeta^R_{\tilde{R}}]_{JI\chi^0_\beta}\simeq&\frac{e}{2\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{12}\Big(\xi^T_L\xi_L V_L\Big)^*_{JI}\Big[c_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{2\beta}+s_{\rm W}(U_\chi)^*_{1\beta}\Big]\\
&-\frac{1}{2}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{22}(V^\dagger_L\xi^T_L\xi_L Y_E)_{I'J}(U_\chi)^*_{3\beta}\\
&-\frac{e}{\sqrt{2}s_{\rm W}c_{\rm W}}\Big\{\sin\beta(\varepsilon'_E)_{3+J}\Big[c_{\rm W}(\xi_L V_L)^*_{2I}(U_\chi)^*_{2\beta}\\
&+s_{\rm W}(\xi_L V_L)^*_{2I}(U_\chi)^*_{1\beta}-\sqrt{2}c_{\rm W}(\xi_L V_L)^*_{1I}(U_\chi)^*_{3\beta}\Big]\\
&-(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{12}\Big[c_{\rm W}(V_L)^*_{JI}(\delta^2U_\chi)^*_{2\beta}+s_{\rm W}(V_L)^*_{JI}(\delta^2U_\chi)^*_{1\beta}\Big]\\
&-\sqrt{2}c_{\rm W}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{12}(\xi_L V_L)^*_{1I}\frac{(m_D)_{J(2+\beta)}}{m_{\chi^0_\beta}}\Big\}\\
&-\sum_{I'=1}^{3}(Y_E)_{I'J}(Z_{\tilde{E}_J})_{22}\Big[(\xi_L V_L)^*_{1I}\frac{(m_D)_{I'(2+\beta)}}{m_{\chi^0_\beta}}+(V_L)^*_{I'I}(\delta^2U_\chi)^*_{3\beta}\Big]
\end{aligned}
\tag{D13}
$$

Here the abreviations are

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big(\delta U_\chi\Big)_{\alpha b}&=\sum_{\beta=1}^{4}(U_\chi)_{\alpha\beta}\frac{(m_D)_{b(2+\beta)}}{m_{\chi^0_\beta}}\,,\quad(\alpha=1,\,\cdots,\,4,\quad b=1,\,\cdots,\,5)\,,\\
\Big(\delta^2\chi_D\Big)_{ab}&=\frac{(m_D)_{a1}(m_D)_{b1}}{(\Delta_{BL}-m_{BL})^2}+\frac{(m_D)_{a2}(m_D)_{b2}}{(\Delta_{BL}+m_{BL})^2}\\
&\quad+\sum_{\alpha=1}^{4}\frac{(m_D)_{a(2+\alpha)}(m_D)_{b(2+\alpha)}}{m^2_{\chi^0_\alpha}}\quad(a,\,b=1,\,\cdots,\,5)\,,\\
\Big(\delta^2U_\chi\Big)_{\alpha\beta}&=\sum_{\beta'=1}^{4}\sum_{\alpha'=1}^{5}(U_\chi)_{\alpha\beta'}\frac{(m_D)_{\alpha'(2+\beta')}(m_D)_{4(2+\beta)}}{m_{\chi^0_\beta}m_{\chi^0_{\beta'}}}\,,\quad(\alpha,\,\beta=1,\,\cdots,\,4)\,,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$(\varepsilon'_{_E})_{_J} = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{(\cos\beta(A_{_{CH}})_{_{1(3i-3+J)}} + \sin\beta(A_{_{CH}})_{_{2(3i-3+J)}})(Z_{_{\tilde{E}_J}})_{i1}}{m^2_{_{H^{\pm}_{2+J}}} - m^2_{_{H^{\pm}_2}}} ,$$
$$(\varepsilon'_{_E})_{_{3+J}} = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{(\cos\beta(A_{_{CH}})_{_{1(3i-3+J)}} + \sin\beta(A_{_{CH}})_{_{2(3i-3+J)}})(Z_{_{\tilde{E}_J}})_{i2}}{m^2_{_{H^{\pm}_{5+J}}} - m^2_{_{H^{\pm}_2}}} . \tag{D14}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{_{B\bar{\chi}\chi}} = {} & \frac{e}{2s_{\rm w}c_{\rm w}} Z_{_\mu} \sum_{I,J}^{3} \overline{e^-_I} \Big\{ \Big[-\Big(1-2s^2_{\rm w}\Big)\delta_{IJ} + [\delta^2\mathcal{C}^L]_{_{IJ}} \Big] \gamma^\mu\omega_- \\
& + \Big[2s^2_{\rm w}\delta_{IJ} + [\delta^2\mathcal{C}^R]_{_{IJ}} \Big] \gamma^\mu\omega_+ \Big\} e^-_J \\
& + \frac{e}{2s_{\rm w}c_{\rm w}} Z_{_\mu} \sum_{I=1}^{3}\sum_{\beta=1}^{2} \overline{e^-_I} \Big\{ [\delta\mathcal{C}^L]_{_{I\chi^-_\beta}} \gamma^\mu\omega_- + [\delta\mathcal{C}^R]_{_{I\chi^-_\beta}} \gamma^\mu\omega_+ \Big\} \chi^-_\beta \\
& + g_{_{BL}} Z_{_{BL,\mu}} \sum_{I,J}^{3} \overline{e^-_I} \Big\{ \Big[\delta_{IJ} + [\delta^2\mathcal{B}^L]_{_{IJ}} \Big] \gamma^\mu\omega_- + \Big[\delta_{IJ} + [\delta^2\mathcal{B}^R]_{_{IJ}} \Big] \gamma^\mu\omega_+ \Big\} e^-_J \\
& + g_{_{BL}} Z_{_{BL,\mu}} \sum_{I=1}^{3}\sum_{\beta=1}^{2} \overline{e^-_I} \Big\{ [\delta\mathcal{B}^L]_{_{I\chi^-_\beta}} \gamma^\mu\omega_- + [\delta\mathcal{B}^R]_{_{I\chi^-_\beta}} \gamma^\mu\omega_+ \Big\} \chi^-_\beta \\
& + \frac{e}{s_{\rm w}} \Big\{ W^-_{_\mu} \sum_{I=1}^{3}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{5} \overline{e^-_I} \Big[\Big(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (V^\dagger_{_L} Z_{_\nu})_{I\alpha} + \sum_{b=1}^{5} [\delta^2\mathcal{V}^L]_{_{Ib}} (Z_{_\nu})_{b\alpha} \Big) \gamma^\mu\omega_- \\
& + \sum_{b=1}^{5} [\delta^2\mathcal{V}^R]_{_{Ib}} (Z_{_\nu})^*_{b\alpha} \gamma^\mu\omega_+ \Big] \nu^0_\alpha \\
& + W^-_{_\mu} \sum_{I=1}^{3}\sum_{\beta=1}^{4} \overline{e^-_I} \Big([\delta\mathcal{V}^L]_{_{I\chi^0_\beta}} \gamma^\mu\omega_- + [\delta\mathcal{V}^R]_{_{I\chi^0_\beta}} \gamma^\mu\omega_+ \Big) \chi^0_\beta + h.c. \Big\}
\end{aligned} \tag{D15}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
[\delta^2\mathcal{C}^L]_{_{IJ}} &= -(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^*_{1I}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})_{1J} , \\
[\delta^2\mathcal{C}^R]_{_{IJ}} &= -2(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{1I}(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})^*_{1J} - (\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{2I}(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})^*_{2J} , \\
[\delta\mathcal{C}^L]_{_{I\chi^-_\beta}} &= -(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^*_{1I}(U_-)_{1\beta} , \\
[\delta\mathcal{C}^R]_{_{I\chi^-_\beta}} &= -2(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{1I}(U_+)^*_{1\beta} - (\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{2I}(U_+)^*_{2\beta} , \\
[\delta^2\mathcal{B}^L]_{_{IJ}} &= -(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^*_{1I}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})_{1J} - (\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^*_{2I}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})_{2J} , \\
[\delta^2\mathcal{B}^R]_{_{IJ}} &= -(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{1I}(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})^*_{1J} - (\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{2I}(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})^*_{2J} , \\
[\delta\mathcal{B}^L]_{_{I\chi^-_\beta}} &= -(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^*_{1I}(U_-)_{1\beta} - (\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^*_{2I}(U_-)_{2\beta} , \\
[\delta\mathcal{B}^R]_{_{I\chi^-_\beta}} &= -(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{1I}(U_+)^*_{1\beta} - (\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{2I}(U_+)^*_{2\beta} ,
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
[\delta^2\mathcal{V}^L]_{Ib} &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\sum_{I'=1}^{3}\Big\{(V_{_L}^{\dagger}\xi_{_L}^{T}\xi_{_L}))_{II'}\delta_{I'b} - \frac{1}{2}(V_{_L})^{*}_{I'I}\Big(\delta^2\chi_{_D}\Big)_{I'b}\Big\} \\
&\quad +\Big[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^{*}_{2I}(\delta U_{\chi})_{3b} + (\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^{*}_{1I}(\delta U_{\chi})_{2b}\Big]\ , \\
[\delta^2\mathcal{V}^R]_{Ib} &= -\Big[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{2I}(\delta U_{\chi})^{*}_{3b} - (\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{1I}(\delta U_{\chi})^{*}_{2b}\Big]\ , \\
[\delta\mathcal{V}^L]_{I\chi^0_\beta} &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big[\sum_{I'=1}^{3}(V_{_L})^{*}_{I'I}\frac{(m_{_D})_{I'(2+\beta)}}{m_{\chi^0_\beta}} + (\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^{*}_{2I}(U_{\chi})_{3\beta}\Big] - (\xi_{_L}V_{_L})^{*}_{1I}(U_{\chi})_{2\beta}\ , \\
[\delta\mathcal{V}^R]_{I\chi^0_\beta} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{2I}(U_{\chi})^{*}_{4\beta} - (\xi_{_R}V_{_R})_{1I}(U_{\chi})^{*}_{2\beta}
\end{aligned}
\tag{D16}
$$

Appendix E: The inverse matrix of $\mathcal{M}$

The inverse mass matrix of six heavy majorana fermions is

$$
\mathcal{M}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \Big[\mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{_N}\Big]^{-1}_{2\times 2} & \Big[\mathcal{M}^{(2)T}_{_N}\Big]^{-1}_{2\times 4} \\ \\ \Big[\mathcal{M}^{(2)}_{_N}\Big]^{-1}_{4\times 2} & \Big[\mathcal{M}_{_N}\Big]^{-1}_{4\times 4} \end{pmatrix} \tag{E1}
$$

with

$$
\Big[\mathcal{M}_{_N}\Big]^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{4m_2\mu^2+g_2^2\mu v_u v_d}{2\tilde{\mu}^4} & \frac{g_1g_2\mu v_u v_d}{2\tilde{\mu}^4} & -\frac{g_1m_2\mu v_u}{\tilde{\mu}^4} & \frac{g_1m_2\mu v_d}{\tilde{\mu}^4} \\ \frac{g_1g_2\mu v_u v_d}{2\tilde{\mu}^4} & \frac{4m_1\mu^2+g_1^2\mu v_u v_d}{2\tilde{\mu}^4} & \frac{g_2m_1\mu v_u}{\tilde{\mu}^4} & -\frac{g_2m_1\mu v_d}{\tilde{\mu}^4} \\ -\frac{g_1m_2\mu v_u}{\tilde{\mu}^4} & \frac{g_2m_1\mu v_u}{\tilde{\mu}^4} & \frac{\tilde{m}v_u^2}{2\tilde{\mu}^4} & \frac{8\mu m_1m_2+\tilde{m}v_u v_d}{2\tilde{\mu}^4} \\ \frac{g_1m_2\mu v_d}{\tilde{\mu}^4} & -\frac{g_2m_1\mu v_d}{\tilde{\mu}^4} & \frac{8\mu m_1m_2+\tilde{m}v_u v_d}{2\tilde{\mu}^4} & \frac{\tilde{m}v_d^2}{2\tilde{\mu}^4} \end{pmatrix}\ ,
$$

$$
\Big[\mathcal{M}^{(1)}_{_N}\Big]^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\Delta_{BL}-m_{BL}} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\Delta_{BL}+m_{BL}} \end{pmatrix}\ ,
$$

$$
\Big[\mathcal{M}^{(2)}_{_N}\Big]^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{ig_1m_2\mu v_d\varepsilon_-}{\tilde{\mu}^4(\Delta_{BL}-m_{BL})} & -\frac{g_1m_2\mu v_d\varepsilon_+}{\tilde{\mu}^4(\Delta_{BL}+m_{BL})} \\ -\frac{ig_2m_1\mu v_d\varepsilon_-}{\tilde{\mu}^4(\Delta_{BL}-m_{BL})} & \frac{g_2m_1\mu v_d\varepsilon_+}{\tilde{\mu}^4(\Delta_{BL}+m_{BL})} \\ \frac{i(8\mu m_1m_2+\tilde{m}v_u v_d\varepsilon_-)}{2\tilde{\mu}^4(\Delta_{BL}-m_{BL})} & -\frac{8\mu m_1m_2+\tilde{m}v_u v_d\varepsilon_+}{2\tilde{\mu}^4(\Delta_{BL}+m_{BL})} \\ \frac{i\tilde{m}v_d^2\varepsilon_-}{2\tilde{\mu}^4(\Delta_{BL}-m_{BL})} & -\frac{\tilde{m}v_d^2\varepsilon_+}{2\tilde{\mu}^4(\Delta_{BL}+m_{BL})} \end{pmatrix}\ . \tag{E2}
$$

Where the abbreviations are

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{m} &= g_1^2m_2 + g_2^2m_1\ , \\
\tilde{\mu}^4 &= 4m_1m_2\mu^2 + \tilde{m}\mu v_u v_d\ .
\end{aligned}
\tag{E3}
$$

[1] CMS Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B**716**(2012)30.

[2] ATLAS Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B**716**(2012)1.

[3] CMS Collaboration, *Combination of standard model Higgs boson searches and measurements of the properties of the new boson with a mass near 125 GeV*, Tech. Rep. CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005.

[4] ATLAS Collaboration, *Study of the spin of the new boson with up to 25 fb*$^{-1}$ of ATLAS data, Tech. Rep. ATLAS-CONF-2013-040; *Combined coupling measurements of the Higgs-like boson with the ATLAS detector using up to 25 fb*$^{-1}$ *of proton-proton collision data*, Tech. Rep. ATLAS-CONF-2013-034.

[5] CMS Collaboration, *Updated measurements of the Higgs boson at 125 GeV in the two photon decay channel*, Tech. Rep. CMS-PAS-HIG-13-001; *Properties of the Higgs-like boson in the decay H to ZZ to 4l in pp collisions at sqrt s =7 and 8 TeV*, Tech. Rep. CMS-PAS-HIG-13-002; *Evidence for a particle decaying to W+W- in the fully leptonic final state in a standard model Higgs boson search in pp collisions at the LHC*, Tech. Rep. CMS-PAS-HIG-13-003; *Search for the Standard-Model Higgs boson decaying to tau pairs in proton-proton collisions at sqrt(s) = 7 and 8 TeV*, Tech. Rep. CMS-PAS-HIG-13-004; *Search for Higgs boson production in association with top quark pairs in pp collisions*, Tech. Rep. CMS-PAS-HIG-12-025; *Search for the standard model Higgs boson produced in association with W or Z bosons, and decaying to bottom quarks for HCP 2012*, Tech. Rep. CMS-PAS- HIG-12-044.

[6] ATLAS Collaboration, *Measurements of the properties of the Higgs-like boson in the* $WW \to l\nu l\nu$ *decay channel with the ATLAS detector using 25 fb*$^{-1}$ *of proton-proton collision data*, Tech. Rep. ATLAS-CONF-2013-030; *Measurements of the properties of the Higgs-like boson in the two photon decay channel with the ATLAS detector using 25 fb*$^{-1}$ *of proton-proton collision data*, Tech. Rep. ATLAS-CONF-2013-012; *Measurements of the prop- erties of the Higgs-like boson in the four lepton decay channel with the ATLAS detector using 25 fb*$^{-1}$ *of proton-proton collision data*, Tech. Rep. ATLAS-CONF-2013-013; *Search for the Standard Model Higgs boson produced in association with top quarks in proton-proton colli- sions at* $\sqrt{s} = 7\,TeV$

using the ATLAS detector, Tech. Rep. ATLAS-CONF-2012-135; Phys. Lett. B**718**(2012)369; JHEP**1209**(2012)070.

[7] F. An *et al.*, DAYA-BAY collaboration,Phys. Rev. Lett.**108**(2012)171803.

[8] R. Barbier *et.al.*, Phys. Rep. **420**(2005)1.

[9] P. Fileviez Perez and S. Spinner, Phys. Lett. B**673**(2009)251.

[10] V. Barger, P. Fileviez Perez, and S. Spinner, Phys. Rev. Lett.**102**(2009)181802.

[11] P. Fileviez Perez and S. Spinner, Phys. Rev. D**80**(2009)015004.

[12] P. Fileviez Perez and S. Spinner, JHEP**1204**(2012)118.

[13] P. Fileviez Perez and S. Spinner, Phys. Rev. D**83**(2011)035004.

[14] B. O'Leary, W. Porod and F. Staub, JHEP**1205**(2012)042.

[15] V. Barger, P. Fileviez Perez and S. Spinner, Phys. Lett. B**696**(2011)509.

[16] D. K. Ghosh, G. Senjanovic, Y. Zhang, Phys. Lett. B**698**(2011)420.

[17] J. Hamann, S. Hannestad, G. Raffelt, I. Tamborra, and Y. Y. Y. Wong, Phys. Rev. Lett.**105**(2010)181301.

[18] A. Abadaa, D. Dasa, A. M. Teixeirab, A. Vicentea and C. Weiland, JHEP**1302**(2013)048.

[19] J. Beringer *et al.*(Particle Data Group), Phys. Rev. D**86**(2012)010001.

[20] Chao-Hsi Chang, Tai-Fu Feng, *et.al.*, in preparation.

[21] H. E. Haber, R. Hempfling, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**(1991)1815.

[22] S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik and G. Weiglein, Comput. Phys. Commun. **24**(2000)76; Eur. Phys. J. C**9**(1999)343; G. Degrassi, S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik, P. Slavich and G. Weiglein, Eur. Phys. J. C**28**(2003)133; M. Frank, T. Hahn, S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik, H. Rzehak and G. Weiglein, JHEP**0702**(2007)047.

[23] Y. Okada, M. Yamaguchi and T. Yanagida, Prog. Theor. Phys.**85**(1991)1; J. R. Ellis, G. Ridolfi and F. Zwirner, Phys. Lett. B**257**(1991)83; *ibid.* **262**(1991)477; S. P. Li and M. Sher, Phys. Lett. B**140**(1984)33; R. Barbieri and M. Frigeni, Phys. Lett. B**258**(1991)395; M. Drees and M. M. Nojiri, Phys. Rev. D**45**(1992)2482; J. A. Casas, J. R. Espinosa, M. Quiros and A. Riotto, Nucl. Phys. B**436**(1995)3[Erratum-ibid. B**439**(1995)466]; M. A. Diaz and H. E. Haber, Phys. Rev. D**46**(1992)3086; H. E. Haber, R. Hempfling, Phys. Rev. D**48**(1993)4280; M. S. Carena, M. Quiros and C. E. M. Wagner, Nucl. Phys. B**461**(1996)407.

[24] C.-H. Chang, T.-F. Feng, Eur. Phys. J. C**12**(2000)137.

[25] P. Draper, and H. E. Haber, arXiv:1304.6103[hep-ph].

[26] M. Carena, S. Gori, N. R. Shah, and C. E. M. Wagner, JHEP**1203**(2012)014, and references there in.

[27] M. A. Diaz, M. Hirsch, W. Porod, J. C. Romao, and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D**68**(2003)013009; Y. Grossman, and S. Rakshit, Phys. Rev. D**69**(2004)093002; Y. Grossman, and H. E. Haber, Phys. Rev. D**59**(1999)093008; T. F. Feng, and X. Q Li, Phys. Rev. D**63**(2001)073006.

[28] B. Pontecorvo, Sov. Phys. JETP**7**(1958)172, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.**34**(1957)247.

[29] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa and S. Sakata, Prog. Theor. Phys.**28**(1962)870.

[30] K. Abe *et al.*, T2K collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett.**107**(2011)041801.

[31] P. Adamson *et al.*, MINOS collaboration,Phys. Rev. Lett.**107**(2011)181802.

[32] Y. Abe *et al.*, DOUBLE-CHOOZ collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett.**108**(2012)131801.

[33] J. Ahn *et al.*, RENO collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett.**108**(2012)191802.

[34] M. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, J. Salvado, and T. Schwetz, JHEP**1212**(2012)123.

[35] WMAP collaboration, Astro. J. Suppl. **208**(2013)19.

[36] Planck collaboration, arXiv:1303.5076[astro-ph.CO].

[37] M. Hirsch, J. W. Valle, Nucl. Phys. B**557**(1999)60.

[38] J. Hisano, T. Moroi, K. Tobe, M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. D**53**(1996)2442.

[39] MEG collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett.**110**(2013)201801.

[40] SINDRUM Collaboration, Nucl. Phys. B**299**(1988)1.

[41] C. Anastasiou and K. Melnikov, Nucl. Phys. B**646**(2002)220.

[42] J. R. Ellis, M. K. Gaillard and D. V. Nanopoulos, Nucl. Phys. B**106**(1976)292; M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, M. B. Voloshin and V. I. Zakharov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **30**(1979)711; A. Djouadi, Phys. Rept. **459**(2008)1; J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber, G. L. Kane and S. Dawson, *The Higgs Hunter's Guide*, Addison-Wesley, Reading (USA), 1990; M. Carena, I. Low and C. E. M. Wagner, arXiv:1206.1082 [hep-ph].

[43] W.-Y. Keung, W. J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. D**30**(1984)248.

[44] R. Dermisek and I. Low, Phys. Rev. D**77**(2008)035012.

[45] M. Carena, S. Gori, N. R. Shah, C. E. M. Wagner, and L. T. Wang JHEP**1207**(2012)175, and references there in.